

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXVIII

MAY, 1950

No. 4

LOUIS VEUILLOT AND THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION

Thomas P. Neill

THE AGE OF THE CAUDILLOS

John Francis Bannon

THE CHRONICLE OF JOCELIN FOR TEACHERS

Lowrie J. Daly

BOOK REVIEWS

Saint Louis University Press

50 cents a copy

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a Year

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A SERVICE QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXVIII

MAY, 1950

No. 4

Editor

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON

Editorial Board

THOMAS L. COONAN
JASPER W. CROSS
ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI
LOWRIE J. DALY
JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

LAURENCE J. KENNY
THOMAS F. O'CONNOR
THOMAS P. NEILL
PAUL G. STEINBICKER
HERBERT WEINSCHL

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri. THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the CATHOLIC BOOKMAN and THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LOUIS VEUILLOT AND THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION	75
<i>Thomas P. Neill</i>	
THE AGE OF THE CAUDILLOS	77
<i>John Francis Bannon</i>	
THE CHRONICLE OF JOCELIN FOR TEACHERS	79
<i>Lowrie J. Daly</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS	90

CONTRIBUTORS

THOMAS P. NEILL, A.M., Ph.D., is associate professor of history at Saint Louis University.
JOHN FRANCIS BANNON, S.J., A.M., S.T.L., Ph.D., is professor of history at Saint Louis University.
LOWRIE J. DALY, S.J., A.M., S.T.L., Ph.D., is instructor in history at Saint Louis University.

NOTICE

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, beginning with the November issue, will appear in new format—6x9—with 64, instead of 24, pages, with a special emphasis on articles and reviews which may be helpful to teachers and with regular bibliographies of current historical literature.

Father Lowrie J. Daly, S.J., will replace Father John Francis Bannon, S.J., as the editor.

THE BULLETIN management is hopeful that this change of format and the additional pages will not necessitate an advance in the subscription rate. In all events, Volume XXIX will prove this hope sound or overly optimistic.

Louis Veuillot and the February Revolution

Thomas P. Neill

Saint Louis University

HISTORIANS commonly speak of "two Frances" which have existed as irreconcilable nations within a common country ever since the early part of the French Revolution of 1789. One nation has been republican, anti-clerical, progressive, secularist, made up mostly of middle-class people and the artisans of the cities; the other has been monarchical, ecclesiastical, conservative, in some respects even reactionary, made up mostly of the old aristocratic families and the rural population. When historians divide the people of France into these two nations they almost always put the Catholics into the anti-republican camp. They usually go on to explain how there have always been a few Catholics who tried to be both liberal and Catholic, men like Lacordaire and Ozanam, Montalembert and Dupanloup, but how most Catholics followed the line set down by Louis Veuillot and his influential paper *Univers religieux*. And, if the historian is interested in the Church, he will likely condemn "the extreme, chimerical, and often dangerous policy of *Univers*"¹ as one of the principal causes for the bitter anti-clerical legislation of the Third Republic in the first decade of this century.²

Such divisions did exist in France throughout the nineteenth century, and it is easy for us to see today that Louis Veuillot's strong and often violent opposition to Liberalism and to the Third Republic increased animosity against the Church in France. In seeing this, however, we are apt to do injustice to the historical reputation of Veuillot; we are apt not to credit him with sound reasons for the stand he eventually took, and not to see that he played a valuable role for the Church in the nineteenth century. To do justice to conservative Catholics like Veuillot one must go back to that decisive period of the Second Republic (1848-1852) and follow their reaction to the day-by-day events of the revolution of 1848 and the resulting struggle between President Louis Napoleon Bonaparte and the Assembly.

Catholics had divided into liberal and conservative groups before 1848, it is true, but the failure of the *L'Avenir* episode in 1831³ and the eighteen years of anti-clerical government under Louis Philippe, com-

bined with the disgrace of the Bourbons and the passing away of most of the older bishops, had left the Catholics of France a more or less formless mass not predisposed to react in any particular way to the revolution of 1848. In the months after this February Revolution occurred two schools formed, one led by Ozanam and his associates, the other by Veuillot. These schools had the same ultimate objective: the welfare and the glory and the prosperity of the Church in France. They disagreed on whether this end could be promoted under the Second Republic, and their disagreement came from differing but equally valid interpretations of the events of 1848.

How a Catholic would react to the February Revolution, and especially to the June insurrection, depended as much on his personal background as on his Catholicity. When the revolution occurred, Ozanam was professor of comparative literature at the Sorbonne, a brilliant young man in his thirty-fifth year. He had attracted attention for outstanding work in three fields: 1) his professional work, which took him back into medieval studies and to which he gave a decided apologetic bent; 2) his avocation of working among the poor, which had led to the foundation of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society some fifteen years before the February Revolution; 3) his lecturing and writing on social questions, for which he is not so well known historically but which attracted considerable attention in his own day.

Ozanam's background was similar to that of most Utopian Socialists, a point worth noticing, because it seems at times that his religion alone kept him from joining the radical wing of Liberals in the first half of the nineteenth century. The second living son in a well-fixed bourgeois family of Lyons, young Ozanam was destined to be a lawyer. At the University of Paris, where he went to study law in 1831, he associated with a group of zealous young Catholics who founded two organizations which have remained important in the Church's history this last century. The first was the Saint Vincent de Paul Society, the second the Notre Dame Conferences. Through these organizations Ozanam and his associates sought to bring alms and grace to the poor in body, and truth to the poor in spirit.

¹ The phrase is R. P. Lecanuet's, *L'Eglise de France sous la Troisième République* (Paris, 1931), II, 339.

² Rev. E. Myers, for example, condemns Veuillot's errors of judgment, his lack of prudence, want of moderation, and lack of charity, in "Louis Veuillot," *Catholic World*, Vol. 77 (August, 1903), 598-610. In the following number of the same review William Seton explains the puzzle of anti-clerical legislation in a supposedly Catholic country by putting the blame almost entirely on Veuillot's shoulders. His theory is that there would have been peace between the Third Republic and the Church if Montalembert's policies had been followed. See "A Puzzle Explained," *Catholic World*, Vol. 77 (September, 1903), 819-825.

³ *L'Avenir* was a magazine started by Lamennais and two younger men, Lacordaire and Montalembert. Its objective was to reconcile the Liberalism of the post-revolutionary age and Catholicism. Certain doctrines upheld by the magazine, such as its advocacy of complete separation of Church and State, were condemned by the papal letter *Mirari vos*. All three editors submitted to the encyclical, but later Lamennais left the Church, whereas Lacordaire and Montalembert continued to do great apologetic work through the middle part of the nineteenth century.

Leadership in the Saint Vincent de Paul Society had given Ozanam a more intimate knowledge of the poor than most social reformers of the time, Liberal and Catholic alike, ever obtained. "Knowledge of social well-being and of reform," Ozanam wrote, "is to be learned in climbing the stairs of the poor man's garret, sitting by his bedside, feeling the same cold that pierces him, sharing the secret of his lonely heart and troubled mind. When the condition of the poor has been examined, in school, at work, in hospitals, in the city and the country, everywhere God has placed them, then it is and only then that we know the elements of that formidable social problem, only then can we begin to grasp it and have hopes of solving it."⁴ This empirical approach to the social problem, this first-hand knowledge of the poor gave Ozanam a large measure of confidence in the basic goodness of the proletarian masses of France. It predisposed him to favor their cause in 1848.

Ozanam had shown a sympathetic understanding of the poor man's position as far back as the revolution of 1830 when, as a young man of eighteen, he wrote his *Reflexions sur la doctrine de Saint-Simon*.⁵ In this work and in his *Origines du socialisme* Ozanam tried to point out how socialism was not the answer to the social question of his day, how the complete solution was to be found only in Christianity. In 1837 he had described France as a nation divided socially into two warring camps. "On the one side," he wrote, "is the camp of the rich, on the other side that of the poor. In the one selfishness wishes to keep all for itself, in the other selfishness wishes to seize all for itself. Between the two there is an irreconcilable hatred which threatens to cause war that will be a struggle to extermination."⁶ Ozanam insisted that the basic question of the day was "neither one of the form of government nor of persons; it is a social question. It is a struggle between those who have nothing and those who have too much; it is the violent clash of opulence and poverty, which is shaking the ground under our feet."⁷

By the time the Revolution of 1848 came, however, Ozanam was not completely indifferent to forms of government. He had not changed from his belief that "every form of government is good," but he had concluded that "democracy is the natural final stage of the development of political progress, and that God leads the world thither."⁸ Such a government, he believed by 1848, "elected by the vote of the people [must] understand better the needs of the people and the duties of the State."⁹ Ozanam's conversion to democracy had

been effected at Rome, where he had watched Pope Pius IX inaugurate his sweeping liberal reforms in the first months of his pontificate. On his return to Paris he told the Catholic Study Club about these reforms and advocated that French Catholics follow the pope's lead in "going over to the barbarians."¹⁰ His address, "*Des dangers de Rome et de ses espérances*," was published in the February 10 issue of *Correspondant*. Its message is summed up in these words: "Let us leave the narrow camp of monarchs and statesmen and go forward to the people in order to draw them into the Church. . . Conquer repugnance and dislike and turn to democracy, to the mass of the people to whom we are unknown."¹¹ Thus two weeks before the revolution of 1848 commenced, Ozanam had taken his stand in favor of its objectives.

Louis Veuillot differed from Ozanam in family background and in disposition. He and Ozanam were the same age and both were located in Paris in 1848. When the revolution broke out, Veuillot had been editor of *Univers* for five years. His background and his experience disposed him toward conservatism instead of the liberalism toward which Ozanam was inclined. Veuillot was born of peasant folks who moved to Paris when Louis was still a youngster. He grew up on the streets of Paris, receiving no formal education past the primary years. "The streets of Paris formed the education of my mind," he later wrote bitterly, "and some young men in whose company I had to live formed the education of my heart. When in my misery, in my isolation and solitude, I needed to learn a prayer, it was blasphemy that was taught me."¹²

At the age of seventeen Veuillot obtained an editorial position on *Echo de Rouen*, and from there he worked his way up on various papers, eventually returning to Paris in 1836, where his striking style and violent disposition began to attract a wide following. He was a physically powerful man described by his brother Eugène as a *condotierri* of the pen without any sense of

⁸ This statement is in Ozanam's article of February 10, 1848, in the *Correspondant*, which unfortunately is not included in his *Oeuvres complètes*. It is cited by Albert Schimberg, *The Great Friend: Frederick Ozanam* (Milwaukee, 1946), 215.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ This phrase alludes to the Church's baptizing of the barbarian invaders when the Roman Empire was disintegrating. Ozanam could have heard the oration of Daniel O'Connell preached in Rome by Joachim Ventura, in which the noted preacher developed the parallel at some length. In a letter to his friend Foisset, Ozanam explained what he meant thus: "To leave Byzantium and go over to the barbarians is to leave the camp of statesmen and kings, who are slaves to selfish and dynastic interests . . . for the camp of the people and the nation. To go over to the people is, following the example of Pius IX, to interest ourselves in the people, who have needs and no rights, who justly demand work and food. . . . To go over to the people is to cease to play the part of the Mazzinis, of the Ochsenbeins and of the Henri Heines, and to devote ourselves instead to the service of the mass of the people, in rural as well as in urban areas. It is in that sense that to go over to the barbarians signifies to go over to the mass of the people, but it is to withdraw them from their barbarity, to make them good citizens and good followers of Christ, to elevate them in morality and truth, to make them fit for, and worthy, of the liberty of the children of God." In Baunard, *op. cit.*, 255.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 254.

¹² Cited by F. Drouet, "Glimpses of a Great Catholic Soul, Louis Veuillot," *Catholic World*, Vol. 97 (1913), 475.

(Please turn to page eighty-two)

⁴ *Origines du socialisme*, in *Oeuvres complètes de A. F. Ozanam* (Paris, 1855), VII, 187. I have used the translation of this passage in Baunard's excellent *Ozanam in his Correspondence* (English translation by an anonymous Irish Saint Vincent de Paul member. New York, 1925), p. 279.

⁵ Both these works are to be found in Volume VII of the *Oeuvres complètes*. This eight-volume edition, incidentally, is very poorly done. It was put out two years after Ozanam's death and it does not contain any of his valuable correspondence. The first six volumes consist of his historical works, the last two are *Mélanges* haphazardly collected and uncritically published.

⁶ Ozanam to Cunier, March 9, 1837, in *Letters of Frederic Ozanam*, translated and edited by Ainslie Coates (London, 1886), 184-185.

⁷ Ozanam to Lallier, November 5, 1836, in *ibid.*, 169.

The Age of the Caudillos

John Francis Bannon

Saint Louis University

LATIN AMERICAN historiography is a relatively young science and as such has its large share of problems. The historians of Europe have been at the game of telling the story of their nations for a long time and have been able to sift the mass of facts and events, movements and personalities, until it is relatively easy to cull the most important and meaningful for incorporation into a workable and justifiable synthesis. The historiography of the United States, too, is beginning to show certain basic patterns. Not so that of Latin America, especially when one seeks to bring something of unity into the twenty individual national stories. The problems of selection and grouping, of segregation and synthesis still baffle the historians of Latin America. It is only by continual experimentation and exchange of ideas that a solution or solutions can be found. With such a thought in mind the following observations are offered.

Air-tight chronological divisions in the story of human development are impossible to set. Yet, for convenience sake, it is often helpful to break down the story of a life or of humanity itself into ages or periods. The element of flexibility must always be present when there is question of a group. However, if there are certain influences which affect all members of the group at a given time, one has at least one term for a division. He is hardly fortunate enough to have both. The attainment of nationhood by the Latin Americas toward the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century can be taken as a starting point—granting that one or other achieved independence at a much later date, as Cuba and Panama. Where to end the “early national period” for Latin America as a whole is more difficult to determine. And what to call the age is of a kind. The absence of uniform development within the twenty Latin Americas renders the first of these trying, but one might be reasonably safe in setting the early years of the twentieth century as another term. Next, therefore, is the task of finding a name for this time span.

The designation, “The Age of the Caudillos,” may not be the best nor the most proper, but does emphasize a phenomenon of those last three quarters of the nineteenth century in the Latin Americas which is very characteristic, namely *caudillismo*. This may seem to overplay the political aspect of the period; but such is not necessarily so. The *caudillos*, to a very considerable degree, represent the whole society which saw their rise and their predominance, a society trying desperately to find itself and either powerless to prevent or, perhaps, half willing to accept a radical solution. The suggested name for the era need not imply that *caudillismo* ceased to exist as a phenomenon in Latin America by the early years of the twentieth century. This would be a false conclusion in the face of evidence of more contemporary

years. But by that time the peculiar society of the *caudillos* had changed considerably and was moving toward a new maturity, another stage in the process of development. Almost all of the Latin Americas had outgrown their “teen-age” restlessness and instability and were taking on some, at least, of the characteristics of early young manhood.

The last three quarters of the nineteenth century constitute an age of adjustment in the lives of the Latin Americas. After a closely guarded childhood, they suddenly break away and seek to stand on their own feet in a world which itself is going through a period of tremendous change, occasioned by the two great revolutions which came into Western life in the latter half of the eighteenth century—the Intellectual Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. These two create the atmosphere in which the Latin Americas must live and survive. During this period under discussion the first of these, the Intellectual Revolution, has the greatest influence on Latin American development; in the last half-century the impact of the second has been a greater factor.

The so-called “Age of the Caudillos,” then, is a period in which young nations are seeking to make their lives conform to a new pattern of society in which liberty, freedom, and equality are the guiding principles. Due to circumstances of their colonial background, the Latin Americas were ill-prepared for the sudden revolution in their lives, their institutions, their philosophies, and their general attitudes. Intellectually convinced of the validity of the new ideas, they struck out for themselves and were able to make good their independence from mother-countries. But independence soon proved to be more easily won than mastered.

Liberty, freedom, equality, and the rest had been very attractive in the writings of the men who had proposed a “New Regime.” Unfortunately, it was only thus that the Latin Americas knew such things—from books. They had had no House of Burgesses, no General Court, no Assembly in which to train their political talents during colonial centuries. It was a far cry from the salon of the literati to the floor of a chamber or a congress. There had been little or no equality in a society in which the Indian was a ward of the Crown, the Negro a slave, and the vast majority of white men excluded from preëminence in public life by the geographic accident of their birthplace. Latin Americans had rarely, if ever, been asked for their opinion as to policies. These last came to them ready-made, from autocratic crowns or equally powerful royal agencies, and all that was asked of the colonials was unquestioning obedience. Free expression of one’s opinion might well have been construed as treason, and as a result few Latins in the colonial centuries took the risk. Toler-

tion of dissident religious beliefs had not been necessary, since none other than Roman Catholicism had been allowed to enter the Ibero-American empires. Opportunity had been a closely guarded gift of the Crown, to be granted or withheld as the royal will felt itself best served. Hence, it was a strange new experience which faced the Latin Americas in the late 1820's. They had, so to speak, a blueprint for their building, which they could read more or less well, but no experienced contractors, no skilled laborers, and few materials for the actual construction. Anglo-American brethren had been more fortunate and much better equipped, and by temperament and outlook they were better fitted to meet the challenging requirements of building a modern democratic state and of living, on their own, in a modern democratic society.

Attitudes toward the new ideas soon divided Latin Americans into two rival camps or political parties, Conservatives and Liberals. The first were not the inveterate enemies of the new ideas that their European namesakes were. There were many things about the Old Regime which American Conservatives were more than willing to discard. The *criollos* had never been enthusiastic for an autocracy which held them down, which had closed to them positions of trust and power, which had imposed heavy taxes on their fortunes. They certainly did not want to "conserve" such things. Their *mestizo* allies in the fight for independence and now co-sharers of the responsibilities of leadership were of the same mind. Many American churchmen were perfectly content to welcome a regime which would put an end to the *Patronato Real*, that the Church might regain her independence. It was the rare Latin American Conservative who would have yearned for the "old days." However, as a group, these Conservatives—landlords, men of wealth, men of proud American names—wanted a society in which liberty and equality would be theirs to enjoy, but theirs, also, to control and to disburse, as it served their advantage. On the other hand, they were not averse to strong rule, provided they or one of theirs exercised it, and, once more, provided that it redounded to their advantage. Equality was a fine, a noble ideal, for themselves, to make them the equal of any *peninsular*, but they had little trouble in convincing themselves that it might be dangerous to allow the common people to rise to the same level with themselves. It would almost surely prove both socially ruinous and economically devastating, were the Indian to be loosed from his peonage and the Negro slave from his bondage. The men of the Church were not always opposed to the broad interpretation of these new ideas, as the *criollo* and *mestizo* "aristocracy" regularly was, but they did find ample reason to contest the meaning which the Liberal read into liberty, equality, progress, and the rest. Thus, they were inclined to string along with the "aristocracy." Therefore, a powerful segment of white and near-white leadership would adjust slowly to the intellectual phase of "modernization."

The Liberals—professional men, university men, business men—were crusading idealists. They, like the Conservatives but for different reasons, were equally ill-

prepared to put their ideals into practice. They accepted the new ideas at face value, in their most literal sense, and without question; they sought to enforce them in government and in society without reservation and without restriction and, most of all, without delay. In theory, they did not shy away from liberty. Rousseau had told them that all men are naturally good, that maladjustments and social iniquities are traceable to society, not to man's nature; he had promised that, once man had regained his freedom from the incubus of traditional restrictions, man's innate goodness would once again show forth, and the world would be a paradise in which natural rights would be respected and Reason would have a chance to rule without interference. They believed Rousseau and those other men of the eighteenth century who had given the recipe for "progress." The Liberals, too, inherited these men's burning hate for the Old Regime and the Church, the great obstacles to "progress." Nor did the Liberals retreat from the concept of equality in its most literal sense. Indian, even Negro, like the white man, was created equal, had the same natural rights, deserved the same opportunities. If he was ignorant, the Liberal would educate him; if he was poor, the Liberal would endow him, to be sure at the expense of the rich; if he was underprivileged, the Liberal would right the balance. The Church, outmoded and proved worthless, obscurantist, obstructionist by the "champions of progress," had to be curtailed in her power, her influence over simple minds broken, her wealth put to productive purposes, and her churchmen kept within "modern" bounds. Few Liberals would have wished to destroy her altogether. She was, after all, part of a past, part of the Latin nationalism; properly controlled, she might still serve useful purposes, as a policeman of morals and conduct for the masses, but even for this she had to be taught to know and to keep her place.

Under the domination now of one and now of the other of these two definitely extremist camps the Latin Americas were to grow up. Unfortunately, by comparison with Anglo-American fellows to the north, the Latin American did not have a frontier, or at least did not use the ones available. There the Conservative might have learned that background and name avail very little against an untamed wilderness; there he might have learned not simply the theoretic advantage but the imperious need of cooperating with his fellows to insure success. There the Liberal might have been forced to desert his doctrinaire idealism and descend to reality; there he might have learned to respect even those whose ideas he did not share. Instead Conservatives and Liberals battled toe-to-toe, yielding not an inch and seeing no reason why they should. They furnish the ideological setting for the Age of the Caudillos—political, social, economic, religious. Each Latin America knew them both.

The problem of governmental organization revolved around two theories of internal make-up, federalism and unitarism. History offered examples, and each pattern had its proponents. To some leaders the United States brand of federalism was the answer; others felt that the

(Please turn to page eighty-seven)

The Chronicle of Jocelin for Teachers

Lowrie J. Daly

Saint Louis University

THE teaching of "monasticism," whether in the college survey course of a "century-every-lecture" type or in the more extended treatment possible in an upper division course, presents difficulty. A modern-day teacher of history, even a Catholic one, is apt to feel himself or herself in the position of the man who was asked to compose an essay on Chinese metaphysics, and who ended by reading the article in an encyclopedia on "China" and the one on "Metaphysics" and then combined the two! And the average collegian, whose mind is almost engulfed in a sea of factual information, frequently finds monastic walls and cloister not only medieval, but unintelligible.

It is true that we are fortunate, now, in possessing Dom Knowles' excellent work, as well as the works authored by Berlière, Butler and Chapman.¹ However, there is another type of material very helpful in the teaching of "Monasticism" and, it is to be feared, but little used; namely, the monastic chronicle itself. The special advantage of a good monastic chronicle is that it presents certain aspects of monastic life in such a vivid and human way. It does not describe and detail the activities of a house full of seekers after Nirvana, nor the work of a group of business administrators bent solely upon the improvement of medieval farms, nor yet those of a library filled with copyists and scribes busily preserving Western culture for the modern college freshman.

Rather, the monastic chronicler shows the reader a group of men trying with varying success and effort to make themselves more like the Christ imaged in their Rule. Their successes and failures prove that monks are human beings as the rest of mankind, but the human institution of monasticism is so shot-through with the supernatural that the least human defects are thereby flood-lighted into significance. Although one can save one's soul more safely in the religious life, he cannot do it "nearly so comfortably". And though, by the vows, monks die to the world, it is a commonplace of ecclesiastical history that frequently they have considerable difficulty in staying dead.²

To aid the student in understanding not only the importance of the monastery in ordinary medieval life, but also to present him with a vivid, interesting narrative of certain events in the history of a great monastery, the *Chronicle* of Jocelin of Brakelond, monk of St. Edmund's, is a useful instrument.³ Jocelin does not record

the every-day events in his monastery, but in describing at length the important events he chronicles, he does give us many interesting details of the monastic life from the viewpoint of one living that life. His work is both a history of St. Edmund's from about 1173-1203 as well as a biography of his hero, Abbot Samson. Samson held his office thirty years (1182-1212), which was almost double the average reign of the thirty abbots which the monastery had from its beginning in 1020 to its destruction by Henry VIII's agents in 1539. Jocelin breaks off his *Chronicle* some eight years before the death of Abbot Samson, and there seems no indication that he continued it at any later date.⁴

Of Jocelin, himself, not much is known to us except the few hints that have slipped into the narrative of his hero. Jocelin entered St. Edmund's in 1173, the year "in which the Flemings were taken prisoner outside the town, that being the year in which I assumed the religious habit".⁵ At the time of Abbot Samson's election, Jocelin was the prior's chaplain; four months later he became chaplain to the abbot. It was from this vantage point, which he held for six years, that he "noted many things and stored them in his memory" and wrote down both "certain evil things as a warning and certain good ones as an example to others."⁶

Within the *Chronicle* there is pictured for the reader not only the monastery with its organization, the feudal position of its abbot (for inside the boundaries of the monastery farms and lands, the abbot took the place of the King's Sheriff), but there are graphic descriptions of elections and appointments, of the inevitable clash of human personalities. Most of all, there is a life-like quality which permeates the whole, for Jocelin is never a dull author. He not only takes us into the monastic cloister but we accompany the abbot on his rounds to the farms and villas, and watch him pronouncing judgment, so just that it caused one man to complain bitterly, "Cursed be the court of this abbot where neither

³ The translations referred to in this article are those of H. E. Butler, *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond* (London, 1949); E. Clarke, *The Chronicle of Jocelin* (London, 1904); L. C. Jane, *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond* (London, 1907). Butler's edition has both the Latin original and a translation. There are but two other editions of the Latin, that of Rokewode in 1840 (Volume 13 of the Camden Society publications) and that of T. Arnold in the Rolls Series, *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, I, (1890). Henceforth, in this article, B is used for Butler's edition, C for Clarke's and J for Jane's. The citation of corresponding passages may help those who have only one or other of the translations at hand. The translation cited is that of Butler, although at times the writer has modified it slightly. C has a table of chief dates in the history of the abbey (Appendix III, 257-278) and records the death of Samson for Dec. 30, 1211; B remarks in his Introduction, xviii, that "A great tower fell within a few days of Samson's death in 1210", but in note A, 141, he dates it at 1212 without explanation.

⁴ B xv.

⁵ B 1; E 1; J "Author's Preface".

⁶ *Idem*.

¹ Dom David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge, 1940); Dom Ursmer Berlière, *L'ordre monastique des origines au xii^e siècle* (Paris, 1924); Dom Cuthbert Butler, *Benedictine Monachism* (London, 1919), and "Monasticism" *Cambridge Medieval History*, I, xviii; Dom Cuthbert Chapman, *St. Benedict and the Sixth Century* (London, 1929).

² W. Farrell, O.P., *Companion to the Summa*, III (New York, 1940), 511. The whole of chapter twenty is excellent reading for the student who wishes to understand the spirit of the religious life.

gold nor silver can help me confound my adversary".⁷

Unfortunately, Jocelin took his reader for granted—a dangerous procedure with a modern reader. He took for granted that his reader knew what the ordinary business of a monk was, what the usual routine of the cloister was, and he assumed that his reader understood that the religious habit does not make men perfect Christians but can only help them to try to be such. Jocelin did not stress the truth, so necessary in the study of monasticism; that, oftentimes, it is not so important what the historian gets into his mind by reading, as what was in there before he began. Therefore, it is very necessary for the student to use books, such as those cited above,⁸ which explain the customs and ideals of monasticism. But the monastic chronicle can be a great help to a right understanding of the position of the monastery in the Middle Ages, as the following examples will show. Those chosen, however, are but a few, necessarily brief and weakened by removal from their context.

FINANCIAL CONDITIONS OF A MONASTERY.

When Jocelin begins his *Chronicle*, he details the monetary situation of St. Edmund's at this time in graphic words.

Abbot Hugh had by this time grown old and his eyes dim; pious and kindly he was, but neither good nor provident in this world's business. Discipline and religion (*religio*) were zealously observed within cloister . . . but in the external matters, things were going badly for, since they were serving under a lord that was simple and growing old, every man did as he wished not as he ought.⁹

Day by day, things were getting worse; towns and hundreds given out to farm, woods destroyed, and houses on the manors threatened with ruin. Unfortunately, the old abbot knew but one remedy—to borrow. Thus, from year to year the debts mounted. The disease spread from the head to the body, from superior to subject, so that subjects obtained seals of their own and with these authenticated their own notes and made their own loans without the knowledge of abbot or convent. Jocelin tells us that he himself "saw a bond given to William FitzIsabel for one thousand and forty pounds and he never knew the why or wherefore of it . . . another to Rabbi Joce for four hundred pounds . . . a third to Benedict the Jew from Norwich for eight hundred and eighty pounds."¹⁰ The origin and increase of this last debt are worth quoting in full, not only for insight into the financial administration of the convent, but also as a sidelight which may help to explain the disgust medieval ethicists have for usury.

The cause . . . of this debt was as follows; our chamber was fallen in ruin, and the sacrist, willy-nilly undertook to restore it, and secretly borrowed forty marks at interest from Benedict the Jew and gave him a bond sealed with the seal that used to hang from the feretory of St. Edmund and with which the instruments of the guilds and fraternities used to be sealed; it was broken up afterwards, at the bidding of the convent, but all too late. Now when this debt had increased to one hundred pounds, the Jew came with letters from our Lord the King concerning the sacrist's debt, and at last what had been hidden from the abbot and the convent was revealed. . . . The abbot was angry and would have deposed the sacrist, alleging a privilege granted him by our Lord the Pope, enabling him to depose William his sacrist when he would. But someone came to the abbot and speaking on the sacrist's behalf, so deluded the abbot that he allowed a bond to be given to Benedict the Jew for

four hundred pounds, to be paid at the end of four years, to wit, for the hundred pounds already accumulated at interest and another hundred pounds which the said Jew had lent the sacrist on the abbot's behalf . . ."¹¹ [The sacrist promises to pay; a bond is given, but only with the convent seal, not that of the abbot. This debt cannot be met either and, finally, the total indebtedness to this one man comes to over twelve hundred pounds. If this figure be multiplied twenty times to give some idea of the relative purchasing power in modern currency, the seriousness of the situation can be better realized.]

Jocelin also cites the example of the cellarer¹² who contracted debts on his own authority and soon found himself burdened with a sixty-pound debt which in turn fell back upon the convent finances. Even though he was removed and another appointed to his office, the debt was not reduced completely, for Jocelin remarks, "the bond has to this day remained in the possession of the Jew and in it twenty-six are set down as the capital sum owed by the cellarer."¹³

It was under such circumstances that Samson took over the honors and burdens of the abbot's office. His financial skill in extricating the monastery as well as the possessions proper to the abbot from indebtedness furnishes the theme for much of the praise bestowed on him by Jocelin. However, the private borrowing did not cease, as Jocelin notes.

One day [Abbot Samson] gave orders in the chapter that anyone who possessed a seal of his own should deliver it up to him. His command was obeyed and thirty-three seals were found. He himself revealed the reason for this command and forbade any obdientary to borrow more than twenty shillings as was often done, without the assent of the prior and the convent. He gave back their seals to the prior and sacrist and kept the rest.¹⁴

Abbot Samson attempted to solve the problem by appointing one of the clerks of his own household to superintend the cellarer both as an aid and as a witness. However, this action did not please some of the monks.

One said to another, "What is this that has been done? Did anyone ever see the like? Never was such dishonor put upon the convent. Behold! The abbot has set a clerk over a monk. . . . The abbot holds his monks of no account; he suspects his monks; he goes to clerks for advice. . . ."¹⁵

But there were other difficulties, too, in allowing such a precedent. For as one monk noted, if this were permitted the abbot, then the king, during the vacancy occasioned at the death of the abbot, might himself take over such authority and appoint his own clerk over the cellarer.¹⁶ Some time later, after other experiments, the abbot reviewed the case thus:

I have often threatened that I would take our cellary into my own hands on account of your default and improvidence; for you encumber yourselves with a great load of debt every year. . . .¹⁷

Then, after explaining the various attempts he has made, he blamed useless feasts and needless expenses incurred by the hospitaller; he then deposed both cellarer and master and set in their places two other monks, together with a clerk of his own table, without "whose consent nothing might be done in respect to food or drink, expenditure and receipts."¹⁸

¹¹ B 2; C 3; J 3.

¹² The cellarer was the general administrator for the house, the buyer of foods, fuel, etc., and at St. Edmund's he also managed the nearby farms whose produce went to the support of the monastery, B xxvii.

¹³ B 6; C 8; J 8.

¹⁴ B 38; C 58; J 60.

¹⁵ B 80; C 119; J 126.

¹⁶ B 81; C 120; J 127.

¹⁷ B 88; C 132; J 138.

¹⁸ B 89; C 133; J 140.

⁷ B 34; C 51; J 53.

⁸ Cf. note 1.

⁹ B 1; C 1; J 1.

¹⁰ B 2; C 2; J 2.

Even this plan of the abbot did not find unanimous approval.

And many said that it was well done. But others said, "No," thinking such a reform to be degrading to the honor of their Church and styling the abbot's prudence the ravening of a wolf. . . . The knights wondered and the people wondered at the things that were done. . . . [Saying] "It is a wonder that the monks, being so many and with such knowledge of letters, suffer their property and revenues to be confounded and mingled with the property of the abbot for these things used always to be distinguished and kept apart. It is a wonder that they do not beware of the danger that may arise after the abbot's death if the Lord King shall find matters in such a state."¹⁹

It was while matters were in this state, that the anniversary date of Abbot Robert's death was kept. Now it was Abbot Robert II who separated the goods of the monks from those of the abbot, and it was decided to celebrate his anniversary with unwonted solemnity. The ringing of the great bells was not lost on Samson, who a few days later appointed another sub-cellarer and made the former one cellarer, although he retained his own clerk in his former position. However, this clerk took on so much dignity that he offended others, and the climax came when the clerk took over the judicial work of the cellarer. When pressure was brought to bear on the abbot because of this, he "gave orders that for the future the cellarer should act as cellarer in respect of receiving money, holding pleas and all else, saving always this, that the aforesaid clerk should assist him, not as his equal, but only as a witness and an adviser."²⁰

MONASTIC ELECTIONS

In his descriptions of the election of Samson at St. Edmund's, Jocelin has given us some of the most human and amusing passages to be found in his book. He first tells us of the various suggestions of the monks as to candidates, and it sounds much like the *vox populi* with a supernaturally good intention, and sometimes just like the *vox populi* without any intention. He notes how the community prayed earnestly for a good successor: "after leaving the chapter house, three times a week, prostrate we sang the seven penitential psalms", and he adds, "some there were who, if they had known who was to be our abbot, would not have prayed so devoutly."²¹ Before quoting the various opinions, spoken "some publicly, some secretly", Jocelin points out that they were conditioned on the grant of a free election by the king.²²

One said of another, "That brother is a good monk, a person worthy of approval; he knows much concerning the Rule and the Customs of the Church; though he be not so perfect a philosopher as certain others, he might well fill the office of abbot. . . . Moreover we read in the Fables that it proved better for the frogs to choose a log for their king, in whom they could trust, than a serpent who hissed venomously and after hissing devoured his subjects.

To this another made answer: "How may that be? How can he, a man who has not knowledge of letters, preach a sermon in chapter or on feast days to the people? How shall he who does not understand the scriptures have knowledge of how to bind and how to loose? . . . God forbid that a dumb image should be set up in the Church of St. Edmund, where it is known that there are many men of learning and of industry. . . ."

Again another said of yet another, "That brother is literate, eloquent and prudent, strict in his observance of the Rule; he has greatly loved the convent, and has endured many ills for the possessions of the Church; he is worthy to be made abbot". And another replied, "From all good clerks, O Lord deliver us; that it may please thee to preserve us from all Norfolk Barrators, we beseech thee

hear us".²³

Another said of a certain brother, "That brother is a good manager, as is proven by the performance of his tasks and by the offices that he has filled so well, and the buildings and repairs that he has made. . . . and he is something of a clerk, though 'much learning has not made him mad'". Another responded, "God forbid that a man who cannot read or sing or celebrate the holy offices, a wicked man and unjust. . . . God forbid that such a one should be made abbot".

Again a certain brother said of someone, "That brother is a kindly man, affable and amiable, peaceful and composed, bountiful and generous, a literate man and eloquent, a very proper man in aspect. . . . loved by men both inside and outside the community. . . . Another said, "No, it would be a burden rather than an honor to have such a man; for he is overnice about his food and drink, thinks it a virtue to sleep long, knows how to spend much and acquire little. . . . snores while others are keeping the vigil. . . . hates all toil and anxiety, cares naught as long as one day goes and another comes. . . ."²⁴

These few citations give some idea of monastic politics during the fifteen months which elapsed between the death of Abbot Hugh and the receipt of the letters from the king demanding that the prior and twelve of his monks come "before him on an appointed day to elect an abbot."²⁵ Some wished to be sure of unanimity among the representatives by electing an abbot even before they went before the king, but others thought this would be foolish since they were not even sure whether the king would grant them a free election. As a compromise, they selected six monks who would choose three nominees and write them down, seal the writing and take it to court with them.

When we are come into the King's presence and have been assured of a free election, then at last let the seal be broken; . . . if our Lord King refuse to grant us one of our own house, the seal shall be carried back unbroken and handed to the six that have been sworn so that their secret shall, on peril of their souls, be hidden forever.²⁶

And so it was done. When the king commanded them to nominate three of their convent, "the prior and the brethren went aside, as though to speak on this matter, and drew out the seal and broke it and found the names in the following order: Samson, Roger the Cellarer and Hugh the third prior. . . . Since they could not change the facts, by common consent they changed the order, putting Hugh first. . . . Roger second and Samson third".²⁷ Then Jocelin relates the further nominations asked by the king, the paring down of the nominees until only the prior and Samson were left. The delegation praised Samson so openly that the Bishop of Winchester remarked, "We understand clearly what you mean. . . . and that you desire him whom you call Samson". Finally when the Bishop pressed them to tell openly which of the two they wished, a majority called for Samson and the king gave his approval. Abbot-elect Samson took it so much in stride that the king said, "This elect thinks himself worthy to be the guardian of his abbey."

Jocelin narrates another election in detail, that of the prior to the convent. Abbot Samson had in mind his own chaplain Herbert, but it was thought he would not appoint this man, "who was but a beardless novice twelve years ago, and a cloister monk of only four years standing, experienced neither in the cure of souls nor in

²³ Samson was from Norfolk. The petition is in imitation of the petitions in the Litanies.

²⁴ B 11-13; C 17-19; J 16-23. Quite possibly Jocelin gives more importance to casual remarks than they deserve.

²⁵ B 16; C 24; J 24.

²⁶ B 17; C 26; J 26.

²⁷ B 21; C 31; J 32.

¹⁹ B 89; C 134; J 141.

²⁰ B 91; C 138; J 143.

²¹ B 11; C 17; J 16.

²² B 11; C 17; J 17.

doctrine".²⁸

When the chapter for election was assembled, one nominated the sub-prior, but the majority cried out against this, "Give us a man of peace". After some discussion the matter was postponed until the following day, on which the abbot wept openly and declared that he had lost much sleep over the matter. He nominated four men, one of whom was Herbert, and Jocelin remarks, "all of them [were] young men of forty years or less, and, as regards the cure of souls, needing instruction rather than already instructed, yet withal capable of being taught . . . these then the abbot named, putting them above the sub-prior and many others who were older, superior, more mature men, educated (*litteratis*), who had been masters in the schools . . ." ²⁹ The abbot then began to praise the various nominees, but in such a way as to build up Herbert. Finally, one of the monks called on the precentor to give the first vote to Herbert, to which the precentor replied by saying, "He is a good man". When the abbot heard the name of Herbert, he turned to the precentor and said he would willingly receive the man if they wished! The whole convent cried out, "He is a good man and lovable and many of the older men attested the same".

Herbert, however, threw a wrench into the machinery by publicly admitting that he could not preach a befitting sermon, at which the abbot consoled them all by remarking that he could memorize somebody else's. Thus, Herbert was elected, and Jocelin gives us a picture of himself in a very human soliloquy.

I being the guest-master, sat in the porch of the guest-house, pondering in my heart what I had seen and heard. I began minutely to consider for what reasons and what merits such a man deserved to be promoted to such a dignity.³⁰

Even though he finds many reasons why Samson's choice might be defended, the reader feels that Jocelin cannot quite reconcile himself to the conduct of his hero in this matter.

These are but samples of the materials which may be used for illustration and interest. As has been remarked, Jocelin stresses some of the casual remarks of the monks more than they deserve, but he also gives us interesting side-lights in monastic matters. Concerning monastic administration, he tells us of the difficulties which occur during the vacancy of the office of abbot,³¹ of the ceremonies connected with the installation of a new abbot,³² of the abbot's care of monastic properties.³³ Jocelin's pen-picture of Abbot Samson is a good piece of literary description in itself,³⁴ and he tells us of the abbot's relations with his relatives,³⁵ with his vassals and knights,³⁶ with other ecclesiastical dignitaries,³⁷ and with the king.³⁸ There is a series of passages describing the abbey's relations with the town which are more vivid and enlightening than many a collection of charters.³⁹

Finally there is the account of the fire at St. Edmund's, the grief of the monks, the translation of the saint's body, the repair of the shrine, all of which show us the deep devotion of the monks both to their abbey and to their great patron saint.⁴⁰

The use of materials such as these will not only stimulate lively discussions but will wean the students from the idea that monks were either medieval fairies or love-lorn dyspeptics. It should help them to understand that monastic life is a life according to Rule, a course of striving towards perfection, which is passed by some and failed by others. In company with Jocelin, they will take "the evil as a warning and the good as an example."

⁴⁰ B 106; C 162; J 166.

Louis Veuillot

(Continued from page seventy-six)

right and wrong, willing to sell his services to anyone who would pay the price. At the age of twenty-four Veuillot set out for Constantinople with one of his friends. But he never got past Rome. In the Eternal City he underwent a "conversion," made his second First Communion, and decided that his vocation was to become a Catholic journalist.

Back in Paris he attracted the attention of Montalembert, the young liberal Catholic peer who had recovered from the *L'Avenir* episode and was trying to form a Catholic party in France. Montalembert was principal owner of *Univers* in the early 1840's, so when the editor's position fell vacant in 1843 Veuillot was given the job that he was to hold till his death forty years later. This Catholic paper therefore came to be edited by a man of peasant stock, and it was read by the little people of France, the lower clergy in the parishes throughout the country, the villagers and the peasants who looked for it eagerly and followed its editorial policy faithfully. Veuillot considered himself protector of the Church and of the French masses. Their enemies, he thought, were the wealthy middle class, the bourgeoisie who controlled the educational system and guided governmental policies under the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe (1830-1848). "A Catholic and a child of the little people," he characterized himself, "I am doubly their [the Liberals'] enemy."¹³ Louis Veuillot had a burning sense of justice, and because he saw the Liberals use the French masses harshly he lashed out at them with stinging ridicule. Thus he has the lawmakers say to the poor people of France: "If you revolt, we will kill you. If you steal, we will poison you. If you are ill, we can do nothing to help you. If you have no bread, you can go to the workhouse or die. It is none of our business which."¹⁴

Veuillot's hard early life had made him severe on himself and on everyone else. In matters dealing with the truth, he insisted, he could recognize neither friend nor enemy, neither brother nor would-be assassin. For Veuillot this meant not only adherence to the truth; it

²⁸ B 125; C 190; J 195.

²⁹ B 127; C 195; J 199.

³⁰ B 129; C 196; J 201.

³¹ B 8; C 12; J 12.

³² B 24; C 36; J 36.

³³ B 29; C 43; J 43.

³⁴ B 39; C 60; J 62.

³⁵ B 43; C 65; J 69.

³⁶ B 28, 65, 120; C 40, 96, 185; J 43, 104, 187.

³⁷ B 81; C 121; J 128.

³⁸ B 97, 116; C 147, 178; J 153, 181.

³⁹ B 76; C 113; J 119.

¹³ "Les libres penseurs," *Oeuvres complètes de Louis Veuillot* (Paris, 1925), V, 1.

¹⁴ Cited by Henry Longan Stuart, "Louis Veuillot," *Commonweal*, I (1924), 15.

meant stating it strongly, even violently. He vigorously condemned Ozanam for writing learned articles when he could have turned his talents against the Church's enemies with violent polemics. He condemned him and "the other apostles of sweetness" for insisting that "man should be sweet, humble, conciliating."¹⁵ And he let the readers of *Univers* know that its editor preferred to take militant saints for his models rather than the much-admired Ozanam. Veuillot had always met his Liberal opponents with their own weapons of sarcasm and ridicule, and because he wrote in an age when such tactics were admired he had a wider following than the temperate and understanding Ozanam when the two editors clashed over the revolution and the policy Catholics should adopt toward it.

Despite their differing backgrounds, dispositions, and journalistic styles, Ozanam and Veuillot were united in their willingness to welcome a new government in February of 1848. Veuillot had no more love than Ozanam for the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe. It epitomized all those attitudes and beliefs he associated with Liberalism; it had been anti-clerical, and, he claimed, it was unfaithful to the French nation and the French masses. He had given vigorous editorial support to Montalembert's five-year fight for freedom of education under Louis Philippe,¹⁶ and so violent was his campaign against the government monopoly of education that he had been sentenced to a month in jail and fined three thousand francs when he defended a priest who had written on the dangers of state control of education through the University of Paris. Veuillot could therefore write on February 26, when it was clear that the three-day revolution was successful: "The monarchy fell under the weight of its own faults. No one worked as hard as it did itself for its ruin. Immoral as Louis XIV, scandalous as Louis XV, despotic as Napoleon, unintelligent since 1830, crafty down till 1848, it has successively decreased the number and energy of those who believed in it."¹⁷

Louis Veuillot therefore accepted the revolution and the Second Republic which was proclaimed on the evening of the third day, February 24. At 10 o'clock that evening he wrote down his reaction: "Today, as yesterday, nothing is possible without liberty; today, as yesterday, religion is the only possible basis for society; religion is the preservative which keeps liberty from putrifying. It is in Jesus Christ that men are brothers, it is in Jesus Christ that they are free. A sincere liberty can save all. The new government has great duties toward France and toward the whole of human society. We wish it the power of fulfilling them."¹⁸

Two days later he offered his support to the Second Republic in a carefully reasoned article. He argued

that Catholics have the duty of supporting any validly established government as long as it does not violate the rights of the Church or of persons; the Republic was validly established, inasmuch as everyone appeared to want it and certainly no one opposed it; therefore Catholics should accept it and try to influence its policies for the common good. In the course of his argument he took a slap at the Gallican bishops. "Gallican theology has consecrated exclusively the divine right of kings. Before that in time and superior to it in theory, Catholic theology has proclaimed the divine right of people. There is only one will which should be always more respected than the will of all the people. It is not the will of any man, but the will of God."¹⁹

So Veuillot concluded on February 26 that "there cannot be any better or more sincere republicans than the French Catholics."²⁰ They ask only one thing, he asserted, and that is freedom for the Church to perform its divinely appointed task. Veuillot was undoubtedly influenced by the liberal reforms of Pius IX, as Ozanam had been. Revolution being accomplished from above in the Papal States, combined with the good-natured revolution from below in Paris, made him believe that this was the means chosen by God for ushering in a more fully Christian society. "God desires these great things," he told his readers. "He desires them for His glory. The glory of God is our welfare."²¹ Veuillot was optimistic on the last of February. After urging his readers to accept the fact "that the monarchy is lost for good, that France has definitely started down a new road, that it is definitely republican,"²² he went on to analyze recent events with the purpose of showing how a Christian republic was possible. He pointed out how there had been no bloodshed to speak of, no privileges destroyed, no sacking or looting, how it had been an orderly, restrained revolution.

Liberty, equality, and fraternity are the work of God, he told his readers, and as Catholics they should work for the proper realization of these three revolutionary ideals. Veuillot concluded his article with a long quotation from a funeral oration pronounced in honor of Daniel O'Connell by the noted Roman preacher Ventura. In the course of this oration, given under the auspices of Pius IX, Ventura explained how the Church had won the barbarians over from despotism to Christian liberty, and then he concluded in words that sounded like Ozanam's: "The Church will turn with tender love to democracy as once she turned to barbarism, she will place the sign of the Cross upon that savage matron, she will make her holy and glorious and say to her 'Reign!' and she shall reign."²³ "Yesterday that was a prophecy," Veuillot commented, "today it is a counsel."²⁴

When Louis Veuillot collected the essays he had writ-

¹⁵ *Oeuvres complètes*, XXX, 246. This is also labeled Vol. IV of the *Mélanges*, which make up the last thirteen volumes of Veuillot's complete works in the edition of 1925 done by his nephew, François Veuillot.

¹⁶ Freedom of education in France meant freedom of religious orders to operate private schools. This was forbidden in the Liberal Monarchy, and it was not until the Falloux Law was passed in 1850 that the government monopoly on education was broken.

¹⁷ From the *Univers* of February 26, 1848. In *Oeuvres complètes*, XXIX, 166.

¹⁸ In *ibid.*, 166.

¹⁹ From *Univers* of February 26, in *ibid.*, 167.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ From *Univers* of February 29, in *ibid.*, 169.

²² *Ibid.*, 170.

²³ *Ibid.*, 172. Veuillot cites this oration as "Oration funèbre d'O'Connell," as though he had a French edition of the work at hand. It was delivered in Italian, apparently in 1847, and can be found in Ventura's *Discorso Funebre pei Morti* (Milan, 1860).

²⁴ *Oeuvres complètes*, XXIX, 172.

ten in 1848 for publication as the third volume of his *Mélanges* in 1857 he wrote in a prefatory note that for some days (later he says specifically for eight days) he suffered under the illusion that the revolution was a good thing and that it would bring about a revitalized Christian society. On March 2 he expressed his first fears that the February revolution might go the way of '89 when, three years later, Terrorists eventually obtained control of the nation. Not yet citing any names, Veuillot complained on March 2 that revolutionary agitation had brought to the surface certain scummy elements, "narrow, absolutistic, passionate spirits, theoreticians never content and never satisfied by any amount of progress, violating the limitations set down by common sense, men who begin to say that the February revolution is not radical enough and that the people are being cheated."²⁵ After warning his readers of these dangerous elements he counsels them to be loyal to the revolution. "Confidence, then," he concludes. "Confidence and courage! Let us go on generously, relying on the spirit of sacrifice and the spirit of liberty."²⁶

The conduct of the provisional government through the first two weeks of March increased Veuillot's suspicions that the good-natured February revolution was following the pattern of '89 and moving toward a Reign of Terror. Minister of the Interior Ledru-Rollin, for example, issued instructions to the departments not to trust anyone except republicans. Veuillot insisted—correctly enough it seems today—that everyone was republican early in March, and that Ledru-Rollin really meant radical as distinguished from moderate republican. Suspicion, Veuillot warned, is the basis of terror and despotism—and the provisional government was growing suspicious of loyal Frenchmen. Socialist demonstrations in Paris, with the emergence into prominence of Louis Blanc, caused Veuillot to feel even more uneasy. Moreover, Capuchins, then Jesuits, then all "unauthorized" orders were expelled from Lyons early in March. Emmanuel Arago, mayor of Lyons and therefore a functionary of the provisional government, had enforced revolutionary laws sixty years old which had been ignored but never taken off the statute books. Veuillot began to dip his pen in vinegar again. What is the meaning of liberty, he asked, of equality or fraternity in a regime like this? The honeymoon between *Univers* and the provisional government was about over.

On March 14 *Univers* carried an important article on "The Catholic Line," in which Veuillot tried to take stock of the revolution and determine what the Catholic position should be. Retracing the events since February 22, he argued that the revolution was a legal expression of the people's sovereignty and that Catholics could not rightly remain loyal to either the Bourbon or the Orleanist line. He went on to develop the point that there was no essential antagonism between the Church and a republic, that there was "a sincere and deep love of the Church for the largest extension possible of civil rights, and an intimate harmony in Catholic souls between religion and liberty."²⁷ Veuillot insisted, against the com-

mon republican belief of the day, that the Church would "prefer the labors and even the perils of liberty to the snares of protection."²⁸ His principal point in this article, however, was his insistence that the sovereignty of the people, as well as true liberty, equality and fraternity, was possible only if religion possessed full liberty. Without religion neither man nor society could be free. Therefore, he concluded, the revolution needs the help of Catholics, and for its own welfare it must grant the Church freedom. Veuillot had not given the revolution up for lost on March 14. He still hoped that its original promises might be realized in the constituent assembly to be elected in the following month.

Nevertheless, his uneasiness and his suspicion increased through the next few weeks. He complained when the government postponed the elections from April 9 until April 23, for he did not like the fifteen additional days of dictatorship under the provisional government and, most of all, he objected because the delay was made at the request of the socialists and the radical republicans who wanted more time to organize against the conservative pressure they felt to be so strong at that time. He was worried by various measures undertaken by the provisional government, little things, such as the revival of republican feast days, but straws in the wind, Veuillot believed, which pointed to a new Terror.²⁹

Ozanam, meanwhile, had accepted the February revolution with undisguised enthusiasm. "In the events which are now taking place," he wrote, "do we not hear a voice calling: *Ecce facio coelos novos et terram novam!*"³⁰ He advised his friends to vote for republican candidates in the coming elections, and though he was reluctant to do so, at the last moment he allowed his name to be put on the ballot as a candidate to the assembly from his home city of Lyons.³¹ He received a respectable number of votes, about 16,000, but not enough for election to the assembly. Ozanam supported republican candidates in Paris, especially Melun, Thayer, and Lacordaire. He drew up a petition to prohibit labor on Sunday. He called a meeting of professors to plan the foundation of extension courses and night schools for adult education. All these were steps toward helping and guiding the emergence of the masses.

Most important of these steps, however, was his role in establishing the liberal Catholic journal *L'Ere nouvelle*. Ozanam and Abbé Maret prevailed on Lacordaire³² to publish a paper which would prove to the

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ "Terror" is a misleading translation of *terreur* which in the French language after 1793 meant government by force rather than persuasion, a period when normal procedural and substantial rights enjoyed by the people are no longer recognized by the government.

³⁰ Quoted in Baunard, *op. cit.*, 258.

³¹ Ozanam allowed his name to be put on the ballot because he thought it would be a sinful failure of civic duty if he refused. He protested that he was a scholar and not a man of action—and he was right. He did not even go to Lyons to speak to the voters, nor did he address them by letter, nor draw up a platform. He was quite happy not to be elected.

³² Lacordaire preferred a constitutional monarchy to a republic. When the February revolution succeeded he was willing to accept the republic as a temporary expedient. In his *Mémoires* he tells how Ozanam and Maret were convinced that the republic was the ideal form of government, and how their enthusiasm and their arguments overcame his natural reluctance and caused him to enter the publishing venture with them.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 173.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Oeuvres complètes*, XXIX, 181.

world that Catholics need not be attached to the Old Regime. They would go even further. They would show the essential compatibility between Catholicism on the one hand and republicanism, liberty, and democracy on the other. Thus *Ere nouvelle* took shape in the minds of these three men in the last week of February. Its prospectus, published March 1, stated that the journal would belong to no party, that it would speak the truth objectively, with moderation and with charity. Its aim was to prevent the Church in France from becoming identified with reaction, as had happened sixty years before and again, liberal Catholics thought, after the *L'Avenir* affair.

Ere nouvelle first appeared on April 15, and on the next day the editors received a gracious note from Archbishop Affre in which he promised them "a measure of support which I have withheld from papers published during the previous government."³³ Like most of the bishops of France, the Archbishop of Paris harbored no great affection for Veuillot's ultramontane *Univers*, and he seems to have been sympathetic to the general position taken by Ozanam and Lacordaire. On the day that *Ere nouvelle* made its appearance Louis Veuillot defined his idea of true democracy and demonstrated that its worst enemies were the "professional" and "theoretical" democrats.³⁴ "Democracy will doubtless triumph," he concluded. "It is Pius IX who carries the doctrine of humanity, not the Czar, not Robespierre or Louis Blanc. The native soil of democracy is the Gospel, it is there, on the soil of justice and liberty that it will be established; but infidel guides can stray for a long time along the route and drag it through rivers of blood."³⁵

Three days later Veuillot reviewed the conduct of the provisional government. He accused it of having acted despotically, provoking riots, violating the rights of individuals and the liberty of the Church. "Paris and France want the Republic," he insisted, "they do not want the Terror. . . Paris and France want liberty, equality, fraternity, but a true liberty, a not impossible equality, a sincere fraternity; they do not want despotism under the name of liberty, nor a brutal levelling off under the name of equality, nor the brotherhood of Cain and Abel under the name of fraternity. Paris and France, in short, want order and life; they do not want chaos and death."³⁶

At this point, then, when Ozanam's *Ere nouvelle* first appeared, there was no difference between him and Veuillot on the desirability of a republican form of government. The difference lay in their respective attitudes toward the provisional government. Veuillot had become critical of its measures; Ozanam was quite generous in interpreting its motives, excusing its shortcomings,

ings, and—Veuillot insisted—shutting his eyes to its excesses. It was the week of civil war in Paris, known as the "June days," that drove a definitive wedge between *Ere nouvelle* and *Univers* which subsequent events were to make wider and wider. It is true that Veuillot had been critical of Lacordaire and Ozanam before June 21, but he had not done much more than heckle them for their vagueness and for asking critics of the new regime to be charitable and understanding of the government in power.

The June days seemed to confirm Veuillot's suspicions that anarchy and despotism rather than Christian democracy were the goals toward which the new republic was driving. On the evening of June 21 workmen rose in rebellion because the assembly had closed the national workshops opened by the provisional government late in February. On June 23 barricades were thrown up in the streets of Paris, and the following day the assembly established a military dictatorship under General Cavaignac. For three days (June 24-26) there were pitched battles on the streets of Paris as Cavaignac tried to drive the workers and students out of the Faubourg St. Antoine where they had thrown up defenses in a final desperate stand. There was a good deal of bloodshed during the rebellion, and hatred between the republicans and the conservatives was increased by such things as the murder—most likely accidental—of Archbishop Affre when he tried to act as conciliator between the rebels and Cavaignac.

Unfortunately the June days divided those who had been in favor of the Second Republic. The more advanced wing became increasingly radical. Some of them openly advocated socialism; others remained republican but now advocated the free use of force and terror to put the republic into effect. The more conservative wing began to look around for a strong man to save them from the anarchy they considered the logical result of the trend ever since February. Ozanam fell in with the first group, Veuillot with the second. Lacordaire found it prudent to withdraw from *Ere nouvelle*, which he had always supported rather reluctantly, and though he was far from sympathizing with Veuillot he found it advisable not to disagree with him on political issues after June. Ozanam and Maret decided to keep *Ere nouvelle* alive, even though its most illustrious sponsor had withdrawn.

Through September and October the assembly drafted the constitution of the Second Republic. Meanwhile the country looked forward to the election of the first president of the republic, which was to take place in December. *Ere nouvelle* was undecided in October whether to support Lamartine or Cavaignac, but by the middle of November it had come out for the latter. By that time only two candidates were seriously considered, Cavaignac and Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. *Ere nouvelle* was not satisfied that Cavaignac was sufficiently liberal, but it considered him "the soldier of the republic," whereas Louis Napoleon was "the instrument of reaction." *Univers* was long in making up its mind. Finally, on December 1, Veuillot wrote a long article on the relative merits and defects of the two candidates.

³³ Quoted in Baunard, *op. cit.*, 264.

³⁴ There is no way of knowing whether Veuillot was referring to the rival Catholic paper which made its appearance that day. It is unlikely that he could have known its contents in any detail, but he could have known the general line it was going to take both from its prospectus of March 1 and from the background of its editorial staff. He always looked on Ozanam and his associates as "theoretical democrats."

³⁵ From *Univers*, April 15, 1848. In *Oeuvres complètes*, XXIX, 201.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 205.

If the voters wish to make their choice as Catholics, he concluded, neither candidate deserves a vote; if they wish to vote on the basis of political considerations and the records of the candidates, one is about as good as the other. As for their respective programs, Veuillot decided that Bonaparte's was the better. He had stated that he was against centralization; he had spoken for liberty of education—but Veuillot was cynical about how much stock to put in either man's promises. He therefore concluded that each reader should make up his own mind. There is no doubt that Veuillot preferred Bonaparte personally. And there could be no doubt how vague, unreasoning, and naive he considered *Ere nouvelle* for its clear support of Cavaignac and its hostility to Bonaparte.

There were other and more important issues on which *Univers* and *Ere nouvelle* clashed in the fall of 1848. In October, Montalembert wrote two letters against *Ere nouvelle*'s support of "a government thrown up by chance and repudiated by the country."³⁷ These letters appeared in Dupanloup's recently revived review *L'Ami de la religion*, not by any means a reactionary journal and one which in a few years was to offer bitter opposition to *Univers*. In these letters Montalembert complained that Ozanam had gone too far in identifying Catholicism and democracy, and he expressed the fear that democracy as it was working out in the Second Republic would lead inevitably to socialism.³⁸ These letters were the springboard for a sustained polemical battle between *Univers* and *Ere nouvelle*. Veuillot observed that "Montalembert expresses our own ideas on the matter,"³⁹ and through the month of November he went on to develop these ideas in the columns of *Univers*.

He observed—correctly enough, we believe, though liberal Catholics did not agree with him—that "basically our [the two journals'] principles are the same, and we have the same aim."⁴⁰ How, then, did they get on the opposite side of the fence on so basic a matter as democracy? Veuillot's answer was that "interpreting events and men differently, we are divided on *la question de conduite*."⁴¹ In the course of these articles on Catholicism and democracy, Veuillot repeated many points which he had made earlier in the year. He pointed out how theoretically the Church approved all forms of government, and how in that year of upheaval throughout Europe it consistently approved the validly established government everywhere. He defended *Univers* against the charges leveled against it by *Ere nouvelle*, and he pointed to the record to show that he

had never opposed the republic as such but had only criticized certain acts of the provisional government. "Nothing has been more frank than our adhesion to the republican principle," he insisted; "nothing has been more decided than our opposition to the monstrous consequences which certain democrats pretend to draw from the republican principle. We have defended freedom of education and religious liberty against Carnot; freedom of voting against Ledru-Rollin; freedom of industry against Louis Blanc; freedom of capital against Duclerc and other financial monopolists; liberty of the press against Cavaignac. . . . When *Ere nouvelle* appeared, on April 15, it found us in the opposition. Not—for it is necessary to be exact here—to the principle of democracy, but in conscientious opposition to pretendedly democratic works and tendencies, where we can rationally see only ruin and anarchy."⁴²

Such was Veuillot's defense of his editorial policy through 1848. He went on to launch a well-reasoned but sometimes too harshly phrased attack on Ozanam's advocacy of democracy. Veuillot repeated his belief that true democracy could be realized only in a thoroughly Catholic society. The Church had no objection to democracy, any more than to any other form of government, if it allowed true liberty, promoted real equality, and sincerely believed in the brotherhood of man. These were Catholic ideals. But the Church did object to those words being used as a facade behind which a group of politicians operated in their own interests. Veuillot condemned the provisional government for not practicing the ideas it preached. He accused Ozanam of being taken in by liberal-sounding words and of "unquestioningly accepting every project, every plan, every idea which is presented under the cover of democracy."⁴³ He condemned him, too, for putting an equal sign between Catholicism and democracy. This equation of the Church with a particular form of government, Veuillot insisted, was the mark of a shallow thinker, a temptation to which weak "progressive" theorists of every age had succumbed. It is fine to say that democracy is good, Veuillot concluded, but to say that nothing else is compatible with Catholicism is saying a good bit too much.

By the end of the year *Ere nouvelle* and *Univers* were far apart. They differed on their interpretation of events, as Veuillot put it, but the differences were accentuated by the personalities of the editors. Veuillot never tried to persuade anyone to accept his line of reasoning; he wanted only to show how wrong his opponents were. Thus his running controversy with the liberal group behind Ozanam convinced them more firmly than ever that they were right in their belief that Veuillot and his associates were at heart anti-republican, no matter what they might say about attachment to the ideal and criticism only of its faulty realization in 1848. Abbé Maret and Ozanam, it must also be remembered, were typical "liberal" thinkers. They tended toward vagueness, and when Veuillot tried to pin them down to specific statements they complained that he lacked

³⁷ Quoted by Baunard, *op. cit.*, 286.

³⁸ Montalembert's stand on the revolution of 1848 causes his biographers considerable trouble. He had been the outstanding Catholic exponent of liberty through the bourgeois monarchy. He had never been a democrat, but he looked on the English constitutional monarchy as the ideal form of government. But in 1848 he repudiated the revolution more completely and more quickly than did Veuillot. Later, on both religious and political questions, Montalembert again became liberal. That is why he is held up as the antithesis to Louis Veuillot. From 1848 to 1852, however, he was considerably more reactionary.

³⁹ In *Univers* of November 8, 1848, and reprinted in *Oeuvres complètes*, XXIX, 369.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 371.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*, 372.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 374.

charity. Veuillot was ruthless in controversy, absolutely impersonal in a virile way, whereas the *Ere nouvelle* group tended to be feminine: they were easily hurt, they saw themselves maligned personally when their arguments were condemned, they had a way of getting away from the matter of principle to turn to concrete cases—and, to Veuillot's continued annoyance, they appealed more to Christian instinct than to syllogistic reasoning.

The two papers opposed each other until April of 1849. By that time Ozanam and Maret concluded that they were fighting against unsurmountable obstacles, and consequently that they were accomplishing no good while they were probably doing some harm. So they discontinued *Ere nouvelle*—and by doing so they refuted Veuillot's charge that they thought more of democracy than they did of Catholicism. Ozanam himself had begun to wonder about the journal. He did not contribute to it in its last three months of publication, and he complained to his brother that some of the contributors were giving it too radical a bent.⁴⁴ Nevertheless Ozanam felt that *Ere nouvelle's* existence for a full year had served a good purpose. "If it had ceased to appear in September, 1848 [after Lacordaire had resigned and the editors thought seriously of discontinuing the magazine], it could have been said that Catholics, a band of timid time-servers, had a republican journal as long as the Republic was a power, but that they had been in a hurry to veer round with the wind of fortune. It is now clear, after six months' struggle, after many insults suffered and pardoned, that there is among French Catholics a sincerity which can endure sacrifice but not cowardice, which is not swayed by selfishness, by ambition or by pride."⁴⁵

Univers had served a purpose, too. It had prevented Catholics from rushing into the same mistake made by the *L'Avenir* group seventeen years before. Unfortunately Veuillot was an impatient man, harsh in his judgment of others. He thought the republican leaders had been given their chance and they had proved themselves enemies of the Church. His conclusions were probably correct. There is no evidence to show that the republicans were any more inclined to allow the Church to live in their France than the bourgeois monarchists had been. At any rate, Veuillot agreed with Montalembert and most Catholics in looking to Louis Napoleon Bonaparte as the guarantor of order and the protector of religion. Though he did not back the *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851, which put Louis Napoleon in power, still he found no reason to oppose it. He looked upon it as the expression of the will of the people—as it was—just as the February revolution had been. Though he never trusted Napoleon III, still Veuillot thought him less dangerous to the Church than the republicans in the assembly. Throughout the Second Empire, *Univers* continued to be in opposition to the government, even suffering a seven-year period of suppression (1860-1867) for openly criticizing the government and for publishing papal letters condemning some of its political moves.

Veuillot was not opposed to a republic in theory, nor to democracy. But he was opposed to the conduct of the Second Republic. His opposition was stated in terms that did not win friends for the Church from among the republicans. It is not good history, though, to conclude that Veuillot's extremism made these republicans anti-Catholic. He can be condemned, at most, for not giving them a long enough period of trial before he declared his enmity against them. He was enthusiastically on their side for about a week, then suspicious of them for about a month, but still in favor of the republic. After the June days he became more and more convinced that socialism or tyranny was the logical result of the revolution. Even at this time it was not republicanism in general, but rather the Second Republic in particular which he condemned. His condemnation followed the republic's anti-clericalism. It did not precede it.

Caudillos

(Continued from page seventy-eight)

highly centralized France of Napoleonic days offered a sounder type of framework. In between, though of no great consequence, were those who would have been interested in reproducing the loose sort of confederation such as had prevailed in the United States under the Articles of Confederation. Centralization met two formidable opponents, quite apart from whatever rivalry may have existed on purely political grounds. The first was Nature herself, who, in South America particularly, seems to have decreed in favor of decentralization, long before man came with his theories. Geography, for example, created three Chiles and as many Colombias. In almost all the countries there was at very least the duality of tidewater and highland. In others, when mountains did not make for division, the location of ports and harbors did. Alongside this physiographic factor must be placed a second force, namely, the tendency toward localism and provincial autonomy brought to the New World by the Iberian pioneers. The homeland whence they came was a patchwork of kingdoms and of provinces within kingdoms, some even with a language of their own, which had yielded most grudgingly to the unifying efforts of Ferdinand and Isabella and of the Habsburgs of the sixteenth century. When to geography and habit were added political and economic advantages for interested groups, the organizational problem facing the young Latin Americas became an element of distressing instability. Argentina knew it in its most exaggerated form, where for long years "port" and "provinces" carried on a debilitating civil war. Its traces are found in the history of Colombia, of Chile, and elsewhere.

The implementation of political authority was another universal problem. When the democracy which the "founding fathers" lauded and wrote into their constitutions proved unworkable and premature, the strong men took over. Most of the *caudillos* sought, first, last, and always, their own personal advantage and that of a tight little group of followers. Most of them were military men, and their power was built on force. They

⁴⁴ Baunard, *op. cit.*, 290.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

came by violence; they ruled by violence; they disappeared by violence. Most of them were despots, and only a very few of the "benevolent" variety. In a society where the citizenry was sadly untrained, inadequately experienced, and psychologically unready for the duties and responsibilities of self-government, the strong man, no matter how out of place in a democracy, was often practically the only means of obtaining even temporary order and tranquility. However, the despotic rule of the *caudillo* was not exactly the correct political atmosphere in which to breed the understanding and practice of liberty and equality and all those other things which were to go into the making of the New Regime.

The process of adapting to "modern" civilization met with another complex difficulty in the area of Church-State relationships. Conflict at this point is quite universal throughout the Latin Americas in the "Age of the Caudillos." Nothing similar has occurred in Anglo America to furnish the basis for understanding by the device of comparison, no matter how faulty. Therefore, here the *norteamericano* must start from scratch in his attempt to appreciate what is involved in the problem as it has confronted the Latin Americas.

The conflict between Church and State in Latin America is complicated by two basic factors: the traditionally strong position of the Church in colonial society and the extremism which only too often characterizes the Latin Americans as men. During colonial times there was a very close union between Church and State both in the mother-countries and in their overseas empires. This fact naturally contributed toward strengthening the position of the Church in all the Latin American provinces. The fact, too, that, due to Habsburg choice, the Catholic Church existed in the Spanish Indies without a rival certainly did not lessen her influence. This last she did not lose in the change from colony to nation, for the early constitutions of most of the new republics named Roman Catholicism as the state religion, often to the exclusion of all other creeds. Hence, here was an institution which had deep roots in the historical past of all the young commonwealths, an institution which was powerful also because of its nature, its organization, and its wealth. The second factor mentioned above, extremism in the Latin character, needs little explanation, since it is clear that in the event of conflict there would be little hope of a peaceful settlement between parties by resort to compromise. Each side felt that all right and all justice was inextricably bound up in its cause and claims.

The powers which the Spanish Crown exercised over ecclesiastical personnel and ecclesiastical funds, as granted to the monarchs under the *Patronato Real*, became one of the first bones of contention between Church and State in the national period. Through the colonial years folk had come to take it for granted that the State exercised these powers by a right inherent in political authority. As a result, in many minds there was no question but that on the achievement of independence the rulers of the new commonwealths were to have the same right of nomination to high ecclesiastical positions, the same right to approve or disapprove papal bulls and decrees, the same right to control Church finances, and

all the other powers formerly exercised by the king. On this point the Church maintained a contrary view. According to the papacy and the non-regalist churchmen in Latin America these rights and powers had been delegated to the Spanish and Portuguese Crowns by grant and, therefore, were not of the inherent nature of political authority. Consequently, if and when the Church chose to revoke the delegation of powers, she might do so, and the State had no legitimate cause to object and no recourse against such a decision. Following the achievement of independence by the Latin American provinces the Church chose so to act, striking thus for her own independence from lay influence. The State, understandably if mistakenly, challenged this action of the papacy.

The somewhat anomalous situation created by the *Patronato Real*, which in later colonial times had become increasingly embarrassing, the Church considered as thoroughly incongruous and improper under the new regimes which independence brought into control in the several states. Even though the patriots and their immediate successors made a profession of Catholicism, wrote the Church into a favored position in their constitutions, and so forth, the Church still did not consider them nor their representative bodies as the most competent or the most fitting agencies for naming the Latin American hierarchy (archbishops, bishops, and ranking clerical officials). She was only too well aware that many of the national leaders were deeply infected with the ideas and spirit of the Enlightenment, which movement was hardly friendly to the Church or to the values and beliefs for which she stood; many of them were Masonic, in sympathy if not always in actual affiliation, and Latin Masonry was certainly not working for the upbuilding of the Church. She deemed it imprudent, at very least, and, at its worst, suicidal to entrust the fate of the Church to such statesmen. Even granting that they would handle their power with the general care and loyalty with which royal patrons had used it, there was no assurance that their successors would be so highminded.

Further grounds of friction developed as the Liberals came into power in various of the nations and sought to enforce certain interpretations of liberty, freedom, and equality. The Church, on principle, was opposed to such Liberal measures as the legalization of divorce, the secularization of education, the sequestration of Church property. Though as a rule the Church fared better in her relations with the Conservative State, still, even there, conflict was not wholly unusual. Thus, during the "Age of the Caudillos" the Latin Americans had to find a basis of reconciliation between two institutions which they definitely wished to retain in their society, the Catholic Church and the Modern State. Few of the nations were wholly successful.

In the field of economics the Latin Americas had to face two serious problems and had to attempt to resolve them in the terms of "modern" practice. One had to do with the organization of national economies, the other with the distribution of wealth. Both involved difficult situations inherited from colonial times; the two were in many respects closely bound up with each

other. Upon the ability to meet the one and the other depended "progress," as the Modern Age understood it. Actual survival in a highly competitive world was often the stake for which the young nations were gambling.

One-product economies had been the standard colonial pattern in most instances. The mother-country had seen little reason for economic differentiation within a given area. Why should the energy and manpower of a province whose subsoil was rich in the precious ores be dissipated in other than mining enterprise? The empire was large enough that a food-producing province could be developed which would feed not only itself but also its mining neighbor. Specialization fitted the Mercantilist scheme very satisfactorily. This may or may not have been the wisest approach, but it must be admitted that it worked fairly well as long as the continent was integrated into an imperial economic unit. When, however, this larger unit broke into a dozen and a half independent national entities, colonial practice became a distinct liability to the nations in question.

No one of the young nations had the experience requisite for a quick shift in the direction of differentiation; no one possessed the native or domestic capital to subsidize such an expansion, even granting that the courage, energy, and vision to undertake such a change were present. To these two add habit—it is always so much simpler to ride along in a fixed groove. The result was the continuance into national times of colonial economic practice and attitudes. And the boon of freer trade with the world outside, for which the colonials had continually struggled, proved to be no unmixed blessing. Argentina continued to concentrate on growing wheat and raising beef; Mexico on mining her silver; Brazil on producing sugar and coffee; and so on through the litany of young republics and their favorite products. During the course of the nineteenth century there were changes in the economies of a few of the nations. New products appeared—Chile discovered her nitrate fields, Bolivia's tin found a world market, and so did Ecuador's cacao—but, even then, there was a tendency to "put all the eggs in one basket." Unfortunately for the Latin Americas, the world demand for her products of field and forest and subsoil grew and many of the countries enjoyed great prosperity, thus seeming to give the lie to men who talked differentiation. But days of reckoning came, when periodic slumps overtook world economies. The "youngsters" were poorly trained for the pace of modern Western life which by mid-nineteenth century had been highly accelerated by the machine, the child of the second of the revolutions mentioned earlier. The conditioning and reorientation process was slow and painful and beset with much internal disturbance.

All of the Latin American nations during the "Age of the Caudillos" continued to be predominately agricultural or extractive countries, a fact which made land the key to wealth. Therefore, land, its distribution, the uses to which it was put, and the relationships flowing from its ownership, all added up to another vexing problem, which cast its shadow over not only Latin American economy but over her society as well. Land

assured the predominance, economic and social and also political, of the *criollo* class and the near-white segment of the *mestizaje*. The unequal distribution of land, a legacy from the colonial centuries, was a factor contributing to the preservation of class stratification, despite the professed belief in the fundamental equality of man. It is an obvious factor making for economic inequality. Not so clearly evident, yet very real, is the connection between land distribution and the political instability so characteristic of this "Age of the Caudillos."

As long as land was concentrated in the hands of the few, there was too small a proportion of the population having a definite stake in the maintenance of law and order. Thus, many folk—the landless and, therefore, the wealthless—had little to lose in supporting a revolutionary movement. The *caudillos* played to this majority, at least in their "campaign programs," those high-sounding and magnanimous *pronunciamientos* with which Latin American national histories are so liberally dotted. Few revolutionary leaders gave a second thought to these generous promises, once they had achieved power and were comfortably located beside the national treasury. The disappointed and thwarted poor were ready for the next spell-binder. And the process began all over again. The young Latin Americas were never quite able to make practice square with theory.

The "Age of the Caudillos" had still another problem along the way of "modernization." This grew out of the presence of the pure-blood and mixed-blood elements in the population. Most of the nations had some percentage of native Americans in their citizenry; some had a high percentage. The diffusion of the Negro and of Negro blood was not quite so universal, but in the island republics and in the old sugar-plantation areas of Brazil the slaves or their descendants bulked to a sizable proportion of the population. The incorporation and integration of these varied ethnic elements into the body politic, social, and economic was a major challenge to leaders who professed to believe that "all men are created equal."

During colonial times the Indians had been in the status of wards or minors, at least legally. More regularly than not they had been thoroughly exploited by the white minority; but, nevertheless, they had been preserved as a race. The North American Indian had not fared so well at the hands of the Anglo. The Indian problem in the United States was never a frightfully serious one—an extinct race creates no difficulties, save possibly for the historian and the anthropologist. At the opening of the independence era in the Latin Americas there was a large group of "citizens," enjoying, on paper at least, newly-won rights and privileges. Preparation for the duties of citizenship, the Indians had none; as for an understanding of the same, they possessed even less. Independence made very little difference in their actual status. Financially, too, and socially they were at a distinct disadvantage. Yet, on their elevation to the proposed national level of liberty and equality rested success or failure in one aspect of the process of "modernization" to which the young nations pledged themselves.

Politically, this large Indian and also the lower-*mestizo* class offered a strong temptation to the adventurer, of whom the Latin Americas have had more than their rightful share. Power could so easily be built upon the votes of this group or, what was more usual, upon its physical support. Economically, it was far too easy for wealthy landowners and others to continue their aristocratic ways, so much at variance with the "modern" pattern, at the expense of the hapless Indian and the poorer *mestizo*. These had no means and no organization by which to fight against this continued exploitation. Socially, this group was ready-made for the disturbing experiments of the social reformers and the champions of lost causes. Poverty, disease, squalor, ignorance, and all the rest of those things which were supposed to be out-of-date in "modern" society were so many challenges to Liberals, Socialists, humanitarians, and others of the breed. The mere presence of such a

class could and did provide another element of instability in the life of the young nations.

Most of the Spanish Latin Americans had written the abolition of human bondage into their early constitutions. Brazil emancipated her slaves much later in the nineteenth century. But, no more in Latin than in Anglo America, was freedom for the Negro the complete solution. He was no better off than the Indian. And the fact that the Latin is less race-conscious than his Anglo brother did not eliminate the problem which the Negro and the Negroid classes presented to the young nations.

Liberty, freedom, equality, opportunity were grand ideals. Profession of belief in and acceptance of the same were the easiest of the steps toward their realization. They presented major challenges, and in distressingly varied forms, to the Latin American nations. Maybe Latin American historiography can find in them and their impact a key to synthesis.

Book Reviews

The Limits and Divisions of European History, by Oscar Halecki. New York. Sheed and Ward. 1950. pp. xiii, 242. \$2.50

What is European history?

If the voluminous historiography on the subject is to be accepted as a guide, then it is the story of western civilization from classical times to the present, traditionally divided into ancient, medieval and modern history.

Professor Oscar Halecki rejects this traditional concept and defines European history as "the history of all European nations considered as a whole, as a community clearly distinct from any other." Therefore European history could begin only when all nations had joined into a unit based upon common cultural conceptions, traditions and principles to form an historical community. Common to all nations were two elements, the Greco-Roman and the Christian, which combined to form a specifically European mind.

A long period perforce elapsed before all the nations of Europe acquired both the Christian and humanist traditions. Actually the making of Europe, Halecki—borrowing from Christopher Dawson—asserts, took a thousand years; it started with Caesar's conquest of Gaul and with the advent of Christianity, and terminated in the tenth century when the Northmen, the Bohemians, the Poles and the Kievan Rus entered into the community of nations. This long, thousand-year period was a period of transition from the Mediterranean Age to that European Age in which all European peoples, and only these peoples, were united in the same Christian faith. This European community had a real unity in all its diversity, a unity clearly distinct from any other part of the world; it occupied a unique position in the world, for some time a position of leadership.

Next, is this European Age, which began with the second millennium, still in existence? By an application of his two-fold criteria as to what constitutes the European Age—Christian and humanist tradition—Halecki concludes that the two elements were opposed to each

other in the Renaissance-Reformation period and were totally rejected in the revolutionary period which began in 1789 and reached a climax in the totalitarian revolutions of the twentieth century. The two world wars ended European leadership in the world, and her fortunes are now being directed by two non-European powers, the United States and Russia; thus the European Age has ended in our own lifetime.

But Halecki does not subscribe to the pessimism of the Spengler school that Europe is lost. Just as the Mediterranean Age was succeeded by the European Age, so the latter is being succeeded by the Atlantic Age, wherein nations on both sides of the ocean are participating. This transition has been in preparation since 1776 and came to an end with World War II when the Western Hemisphere, which has absorbed the humanist and Christian heritage of Europe, took over leadership of civilization.

With the chronological limits of European history set between the tenth and twentieth century, Halecki then approaches the even more difficult question, "What is Europe?" To establish the northern, western and southern limits at the Arctic Sea, Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea is fairly simple. But what is the Eastern frontier? The author proposes a line drawn from the Arctic to the Black Sea, which includes the Ukraine and White Russia as a part of the European community, but rejects Muscovy, which had risen up under Mongol domination and had absorbed the conqueror's political philosophy. Europe itself is divided into four regions, the western, west-central, east-central and eastern, rather than the traditional western, central and eastern.

The thousand-year span of the European Age is subdivided into definite eras. The first period, distinguished by the idea of unity or universalism, lasted until the latter part of the fourteenth century, when it was succeeded by the Renaissance-Reformation period. The latter was a critical era when politics were divorced from ethics and when the idea of universalism disintegrated. Since uni-

versalism was not replaced by any better organization of Europe, the third period (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries) was marked by the balance of power idea, which, however, was destroyed by the partitions of Poland. Europe, having abandoned the lofty traditions of organized liberty which distinguished the first period, was then beset by the great revolutionary crises. Reaping the harvest of secularism which had divorced politics from moral values, Europe was no longer able to find a solution to her problems. "The fact that countries in the very heart of Europe, with old, uninterrupted European traditions, could become totalitarian even temporarily was the most serious warning that the European Age was ending and that its great heritage, if it was to survive, must be supported by new forces from outside Europe." (p. 190.)

This brief book will occasion much comment and provoke much discussion. Some, perhaps, will disagree with Professor Halecki on the importance which he lays upon east-central Europe; others will doubtless disagree with his exclusion of Russia from the European community. It is this very thought-provoking nature of the book which will make it a landmark in historiography. In calling for a new interpretation of European history, Halecki acknowledges the inspiration of Arnold Toynbee's *Study of History* (though he disagrees with many of its conclusions) and of Gonzague de Reynold's *Formation de l'Europe*. It is well, however, to have a presentation of these problems by a famous central-European scholar, whose years at Geneva with the League of Nations and whose teaching activities in the United States (he is now Professor of Eastern European history at the Graduate School of Fordham University) have given him a balanced outlook almost unmatched by other present-day historians. He was a participant in almost every international congress between the two wars, is acquainted with the historical literature of every country and is well suited for the work of synthesis which he here accomplishes. For him the current book is a beginning, the first approach, to what he hopes will be a philosophy of history.

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

A Handbook of Slavic Studies, edited by Leonid I. Strakhovsky. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1949. pp. xxi, 753. \$12.50

An Introduction to Russian History and Culture, by Ivar Spector. New York. D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc. 1949. pp. xxi, 454.

Slavonic Encyclopaedia, edited by Joseph S. Roucek. New York. Philosophical Library. 1949. pp. xi, 1445.

Russia's role in World War II and her rise to a predominant position in world affairs have created an urge among the peoples of the West to learn more about the peoples of eastern and central Europe, but until recently the historiography has been relatively slight. To fill the *lacunae*, numerous books, pamphlets, brochures and articles have poured forth in the last decade, some good, some bad. The present tendency is to synthesize the work of scholars and specialists for presentation to the non-Slavic reading public.

A Handbook of Slavic Studies is by far the best synthesis to appear on the complex history and culture of the Slav peoples. The book, as the editor indicates in the preface, is "primarily designed for scholars, students and general public not familiar with Slavic languages," and is written by leading scholars in the United States.

The project was inaugurated in May, 1944, but due to war-time exigencies and printing difficulties the book did not appear until 1949. Although contemporary material was to be brought up only to the end of World War II, some of the contributors have carried their accounts into 1946 and even to 1947. In all, eighteen authors, most of them well known in this country, have contributed twenty-eight chapters to this volume. Russia has five chapters allotted to it, written by S. R. Tompkins, G. V. Lantzeff, L. I. Strakhovsky and J. D. Clarkson. A separate chapter, by O. J. Frederiksen, is allotted to the Ukraine. The four chapters on Poland are contributed by one author, O. Halecki, and therefore have better continuity and cohesion than the other chapters. Czech and Slovak history is presented by S. H. Thomson, H. F. Shwartz and J. Hanc. Balkan history is covered by D. E. Lee and C. Black, while a general chapter on the conflict of Slavs and Germans is contributed by S. H. Thomson. Slavic origins and primitive Slavic culture are treated by the late Samuel H. Cross. Thus into twenty-one chapters are compressed about two thousand years of Slavic history, from primitive origins to the post-World War II period.

In addition to the historical presentation, there are seven chapters on the literature of the various Slav peoples. Unfortunately, because of the wide scope of the subject and the limitation of space, the treatments become long lists of authors and works, both literary and dramatic, without too much description or analysis. Being encyclopaedic in character, these chapters will prove more useful for reference purposes than for an understanding of the main literary movements.

The same observation can be made for the work as a whole. Without doubt this volume represents the most valuable presentation of the entire Slavic history and culture within the covers of one book. Because of its encyclopaedic nature, as many facts as possible are compressed into a limited space, with emphasis on presentation of factual material and avoidance of interpretation. To a reader acquainted with the histories of the various nations, the accounts are merely resumes of longer histories. To the reader picking up a book on Slavic history for the first time, however, the mass of facts, and especially the long and strange names of persons and places will be almost too forbidding. That, however, is a problem faced by any synthesis of a complex series of topics, and the present handbook meets the problem better than most symposia and composite works. The integration of chapters testifies to the careful work of editing performed by Leonid Strakhovsky.

Lack of space also narrowed the scope of historical coverage to political, domestic history, to the relative exclusion of social, economic, religious and diplomatic history.

Of particular value to the reader, especially to one whose previous contacts with the subject have been

slight, is the introductory chapter in which historical studies available in the English language are discussed. All readers will find the long bibliographies at the end of each chapter equally valuable. Useful and unique is a table of forty-seven pages giving a comparative chronology of comparative historical developments in the major Slavic countries.

Taken as a whole, the handbook can very well be called a milestone in Slavic studies in this country. It well fulfills its purpose of presenting "under one cover a digest of the history and literature of all the Slavs so as to serve as a reference book for the student, the scholar and the general reader alike" (p. x). Although the price (\$12.50) is somewhat prohibitive, the book is heartily recommended for all who have an interest in Slavic studies.

* * * *

In the field of Russian history, college instructors have long proclaimed the need of a good text-book inasmuch as those on the market have not proved very satisfactory. Lately, however, several publishers have announced that new books are in preparation and should be available within the next year.

The present book by Ivar Spector of the University of Washington attempts to present not only a history of Russia from her origins to the present, but also devotes two lengthy chapters to Russian and Soviet culture, wherein literature, literary criticism and music are discussed. It is readily apparent that the author is on familiar ground in these chapters, for he draws extensively on his own *The Golden Age of Literature* (published in 1945). More pedestrian in pace and better related to the environment and age in which the culture was produced, Spector's treatment is much superior to the chapter on Russian literature in the *Handbook of Slavic Studies*. These two chapters are by far the best portions in the book.

Even here, though, the author's definition of culture and civilization (pp. 208-209) is most questionable: culture is something organic and inherent, and civilization is something mechanical and artificial. "Culture implies birth and growth; civilization calls to mind inventions and material betterment. For instance, if a person wishes to fly, he invents an airplane. That represents civilization. But if the same person could grow wings on his body, that would denote culture. Character is culture; manners, civilization."

The use of the word civilization to mean merely inventions and material betterment indicates to what extent the original meaning of the word has deteriorated. Originally the word was associated with the order and stability of the community. Civilization, until the period of Enlightenment and nineteenth-century materialism connoted a condition of society in which the observance of justice prevails and furnishes the people with means to carry out the purposes of their lives. Similarly culture meant the sustained, balanced, harmonious application of man's faculties to the fulfillment of his needs. There need not be a sharp distinction between civilization and culture, for both complement each other as favorable conditions, culture starting with the individual and civilization of its very nature

affecting all. Unless culture and civilization are once again given their true definition, many of the currently popular phrases like "Western civilization" and "defense of civilization against barbarism" become meaningless.

The remainder of the book is devoted to history, with 1917 as the demarcation line between old and new Russia. In order to make the book more readable the author unfortunately tends toward generalizations and too brief treatments of events and personages; these occasionally create wrong impressions. For instance, his statement that Ivan IV's *Oprichniki* held the rank of monks and wore a special uniform of black cassocks over sable necklets and cloth of gold creates the impression that Ivan the Terrible's private army was composed of monks. Actually, it was Ivan's method of ridiculing the monks and blaspheming the Orthodox religion. Similarly, Peter the Great's visit to the West and his war against Sweden are oversimplified and fail to convey the complete Baltic picture which precipitated the great Northern War. The partitions of Poland are described as merely the regaining by Russia of all the "Western Lands" lost in previous centuries. (p. 97.) To magnify Russia's victory in 1812, Spector notes that Napoleon was in a position to array all of Europe, excepting Sweden and Turkey, against Russia. (p. 106.) In reality, England remained a persistent enemy of Napoleon, but Spector manifests an anti-English animus throughout the book. This is especially manifest in his treatment of the "cold war" between the United States and Russia after 1945, which is interpreted as being inspired by England in order to maintain her traditional policy of balance of power.

In the second portion of the book, Russia since 1917, the author bends backward to appear impartial, and here again he is led to make some questionable statements. For instance, in reference to Lenin's socialist experiments, he writes (p. 294):

It goes without saying that this experimentation was attended by much suffering and privation on the part of the human guinea pigs who were involuntarily subjected to it. However, the value to humanity as a whole of the services rendered by Lenin's experiment cannot be overestimated.

Equally questionable is his reasoning on the anti-religious nature of the Soviet government. (p. 284.) "Since many Soviet leaders attributed most of the discrimination characteristic of the old regime to religious hatred, they therefore concluded that if the Church were uprooted, there would be an end to dissension and persecution." He seems to forget that religion itself has no place in Communist philosophy and that its prohibition had no connection with conditions in Russia's past.

Spector also minimizes Russian participation in the dismemberment of Poland in September, 1939, and in doing so inaccurately asserts that "no explicit prior arrangement for the partition of Poland had been reached when the Soviet-German non-aggression pact was signed in August. Actually paragraph 2 of the Secret Additional Protocol designated a line of division along the rivers Narew, Vistula and San. (Cf. *Nazi-Soviet Relations, 1939-1941*, edited by R. J. Sontag and J. S. Beddie, Washington, Department of State, 1948, p. 78.)

In addition to doubtful interpretations, there are several instances of erroneous statements. The Poles accepted Roman Christianity not from the Germans but from the Bohemians. (p. 12.) The origin of the term *Slav*, as being applied to slaves and prisoners captured by Germans and others from among Slavonic tribes, has largely been abandoned by Slavic scholars. (Cf. S. H. Cross, *Slavic Civilization Through the Ages*, pp. 9-10.) Totally inaccurate is Spector's reason for the failure of the Second Peace Conference (1907) called at the invitation of Tsar Nicholas II, for "England resented the Franco-Russian alliance, Germany was wary of England, and Russia was suspicious of all of them." Actually there had been a rapprochement between England and Russia after the Russo-Japanese war, climaxed by the signing of the Anglo-Russian Convention at the very time when the Peace Conference was in session.

Had Spector's chapters on the history of the Russian people been up to the standard of his chapters on their cultural accomplishments, this book might have provided the needed Russian history text-book. As it is, teachers of the subject must await the other books promised by the publishers.

* * * *

The most ambitious and all-inclusive undertaking in recent Slavic studies is the *Slavonic Encyclopaedia*, edited by Joseph S. Roucek. Some one hundred and twenty contributors, most of them authorities in their respective fields, have combined their talents to present the thousands of articles on notices which compose the *Encyclopaedia*.

Like the *Handbook of Slavic Studies*, the *Slavonic Encyclopaedia* does not intend to be a scholarly reference work, but rather endeavors to be a general introduction to the Slavic world for English-speaking peoples, the first such encyclopaedic endeavor in the English language. Coverage is given not only to the most important historical, governmental and cultural developments of the Slavic peoples, but follows their fortunes into their new homes abroad. Although the editor addresses this volume to the Anglo-Saxon world, his focus is almost wholly on the American reader, for the articles on Slavs in emigration pertain almost entirely to the settlers in the United States.

As a pioneer work, the compilation deserves much credit. There are thousands of references, many found in no other encyclopaedia, to individuals, places, events and general topics. References to individuals and places are generally brief, but the discussions of institutions are more detailed and form the most interesting and useful portions of the work. Here can be found relatively lengthy treatments on such topics as architecture, army and navy, art, constitutions, various national groups abroad, drama, economic geography, education, foreign policy, history, historiography, the Jews, literature, music, theater, law, nationalism, politics, government, folklore, etc., of each of the Slavic peoples. The smaller Slavic groups receive due treatment, especially the Ukrainians, who are always considered as a nation distinct from the Russian.

However, the complexity of plotting a new path in Slavic studies has at times led the editors into thorny

brambles. The most striking defect is the lack of balance in the apportionment of space. Whereas some items have been pruned to a few words, others have been expanded into several columns, without apparent justification. Similarly, contemporary personalities and events receive more extensive treatment than those of medieval or early modern times. It is difficult to understand at times why space has been devoted to personalities in the United States, whereas fairly important European figures are omitted. For example, 22, 22, 13 and 42 lines are devoted respectively to Danny Kaye, Sylvia Sidney, Pola Negri, and Vera Ralston, but one looks in vain for articles on Tsars Alexander I, II and III, on Peter the Great or on Pushkin. Typical perhaps is the allotment of almost as much space to Anton Cermak, former mayor of Chicago, as to Lenin, and three times as much as to Stalin.

It is apparent also that some of the articles were written in the heat of war-time emotion, but in the main, personal opinions and interpretations have been reduced to a minimum. Some of the items have been taken bodily from periodicals, and their more wordy and literary style contrasts sharply with the remainder of the severely pruned notices.

Despite these minor imperfections, the *Slavonic Encyclopaedia* will provide a readily-available source of information on Slavic personalities and events. It will also serve as a guide to future compilers, both for what should be included and what should be omitted.

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

Readings in Twentieth-Century European History, edited by Alexander Baltzly and A. William Salomone. New York. Appleton-Century-Crofts. 1950. pp. xxv, 610. \$5.00

These readings were designed to supplement the text by F. Lee Bennis in the "Europe Since 1914" course offered in most colleges. This collection, its authors state, "is intended to be neither a source-book nor a collection of documents. It is a book of readings in the widest and most diversified sense, ranging from the solemn official proclamation of governments to the journalistic impressions of spectators—with much else in between." This is the distinctive feature of Baltzly's and Salomone's collection. Historians will argue whether the document collection or the type here reviewed is superior. Our own impression is that for contemporary history the documents are less meaty and less meaningful than speeches and contemporary comment on events.

The selections are well arranged. Like Bennis' text, they are about evenly divided between international affairs on the one hand and the domestic problems of the European nations on the other. The emphasis is on political history at the expense of social and cultural affairs. Selections from Freud and Spengler and Toynbee, from Kafka, Mann and other writers of the age would round out these readings to give a better picture of the age. But the editors are probably right in deciding that their book was already long enough without getting into intellectual and social matters.

THOMAS P. NEILL.

The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor, by Henry J. Browne. Washington. Catholic University of America Press. 1949. pp. xvi, 415. Paper \$4.00; cloth, \$4.50

The Knights of Labor, America's first successful labor organization of national compass, was founded in Philadelphia in 1869. The new body became, from the very beginning of its existence, an object of the widespread public suspicion of labor organizations that had recently been generated anew by the excesses attributed to the Molly Maguires. More important, in its consequences, was the generally unenthusiastic attitude adopted towards the Knights by the Catholic hierarchy and clergy of the United States, an attitude ranging from studied caution to outright hostility. This mistrust was founded on two distinctive characteristics of the organization: its secrecy and its ritualistic observances. Drawing on the unhappy experiences of labor societies in the past, the constitution of the Knights enjoined strict secrecy in regard to the activities of the order and the identity of its members. Uriah S. Stephens, first master workman of the Knights, and himself a Mason, an Odd Fellow, and a Knight of Pythias, drew up the ritual of the nascent labor society and into it he incorporated a number of elements unquestionably derived from masonic rituals.

The Church's objection to its members having a part in the ritualistic observances prescribed in Stephen's formulas is easily understood. As to the necessity of some measure of secretiveness to protect the members of legitimate labor organizations from the retaliatory measures—dismissal, the blacklist, and the like—so generally resorted to in that day by employers against known members of labor unions or societies, there is not now and never should have been any doubt. But long experience with secret societies, particularly with those of masonic character, as well as with those committed to the violent overthrow of the existing social and political order, had bred in churchmen a proclivity to suspect at first sight all organizations that exacted an oath or promise of secrecy from their members. It cannot be denied, on the other hand, that all too many American bishops and priests were slow to grasp the distinction between the motives underlying the secrecy of the masonic and revolutionary societies and those of the Knights of Labor.

In 1879 Terence V. Powderly, a Catholic of Irish parentage, became grand master workman and retained the leadership of the society for the succeeding fourteen years. In the Knights' Detroit convention of 1881 he succeeded in having the more categorical provisions of secrecy abrogated, while retaining the measure of confidentially deemed essential to the protection of the society and its members. The Detroit assembly also, according to Powderly's testimony, abolished the oath formerly required of members and substituted "a word of havoc." The same meeting likewise provided, it would seem, for the elimination of the sectarian elements from the ritual. These concessions did not remove all ecclesiastical misgivings regarding the Knights, but there appears to have been a growing appreciation of the organization's objectives on the part of many church-

men.

The cautious attitude of the American hierarchy towards this new and, by the mid-eighties, dominant labor group, was terminated by the action of Archbishop Taschereau of Quebec, who in 1884 and 1886 secured from the Holy Office a formal condemnation in his diocese and directed that no member of the society be admitted to the sacraments. The American prelates generally, however, were not inclined to feel themselves affected by Rome's action in the Quebec case. Sagacious American bishops felt with Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore that grave injury to religion in the United States would result from a condemnation of the Knights. Gibbons, with the support of like-minded ecclesiastics, was able to convince Rome of the true nature of the issues involved. Under date of August 29, 1888, the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda informed Gibbons of the decision of the Holy Office, arrived at on August 16, that the Knights of Labor could be tolerated provided any objectionable features of its constitution be amended.

The success of Gibbons and his co-workers in averting a condemnation of the Knights was of vastly greater significance in its ultimate than its immediate consequences. By 1888 the Knights of Labor had passed the zenith of its strength and was already headed towards the dissolution which overtook it a few years later, an outcome induced in large part by the disintegrating elements inherent in its organic makeup. In a broader and more universal sense, Rome's decision was a presage, although in a largely negative form, of the Church's position in the new era of socio-economic relations that was already dawning. By refraining from condemning the Knights in the country of their greatest prevalence, the Church in the United States was spared the reiteration of the charge that it was allied with the forces of wealth and privilege and opposed to the just aspirations of the toiling masses. American labor was spared this great temptation to anti-clericalism and irreligion. Three years later came *Rerum Novarum*.

The author of this volume essays to trace the history of this protracted and involved series of episodes which, taken together, make up the story of the relations, one with the other, of the Church and the Knights of Labor. In a sequence of nine chapters Father Browne sets forth the background, secular and canonical, of the issues involved in the discussions and recriminations of the years 1879-1888; sketches the foundation and early development of the Knights; limns the initial alignment of the American hierarchy on the dilemma confronting them in the new secret labor organization; describes the belligerently unfriendly attitude of Archbishop Taschereau towards the Knights and the echoes of this attitude in the United States; recounts the activity of the United States hierarchy in 1886, when the question of an official stand on the Knights could no longer be evaded; relates the course of the Roman negotiations which issued in the decree of conditional toleration of 1888; and summarizes the American reaction to and aftermath of Rome's decision.

The most conspicuous characteristic of the volume is its reliance upon unpublished primary sources. Father

Browne had the good fortune of being able to make extensive use, for the first time, of the papers of the most persistently prominent personage throughout the whole period of controversy, Terence V. Powderly. A widely extended search in diocesan archives of the United States and Canada provided a further abundance of data. These findings were supplemented by material extracted from the contemporary Catholic press, the files of which yielded information on the overtones of semi-official and personal reactions.

The facts garnered from these sources have been woven into a narrative of great fullness of detail. Conscious of the bearing of Archbishop Tachereau's actions on events in the United States, Father Browne has gone to great pains to present the mind of the Quebec prelate as well as that of the staunch Canadian friend of labor, John J. Lynch, C. M., Archbishop of Toronto. The author's endeavor to present an exhaustive study of the relations between the Church and the Knights in all their ramifications had led, perhaps inevitably, to the incorporation of such a mass of detail as may likely discourage the average reader, and, perchance, even the less rugged among the brotherhood of scholars. Many readers will regret that Father Browne did not see fit to incorporate into his volume a summary chapter in which the more significant fundamental aspects of the complicated negotiations might have been recapitulated. Similarly, it was undoubtedly this same striving for fullness of treatment that dictated the author's adoption of a literary style of rigorous compression which at times fails on the score of clarity.

The features of the narrative do not detract, however, from the definitive character of Father Browne's book. His task was not an easy one. Strong echoes of the most elemental of human instincts as well as of lofty spiritual ideals permeate the words and deeds elicited by these dozen years' negotiations. Honored names pass across the scene and some of them emerge shorn of a share of the renown which posterity has been inclined to assign them. Yet, Father Browne has resolutely set down his findings with a highly commendable measure of objectivity. His treatment of the chief protagonist on the ecclesiastical side of the final phase of the discussions, Cardinal Gibbons, is restrained. He does not hesitate to show the rather late awakening of Gibbons' consciousness of the implications of the social question, and he does not claim for him the sole credit for the successful termination of the negotiations at Rome in 1887. Unfortunately, in this reviewer's opinion, he departs momentarily from the ground of solid documentary evidence when, pp. 348-349, he endeavors to trace the connection between Gibbons' Memorial and *Rerum Novarum*. Powderly, too, is treated with fairness, and even sympathy, but without the maudlin exaggeration which would make him a victim of clerical intransigence.

A truth of broader implication emerges from a study of the attitudes of the bishops of the United States on the general question of the rights of labor during the years covered by this study. The excerpts from their correspondence reproduced in Father Browne's work indicate how precarious it is to segregate the

American hierarchy of that day into any hard and fast classification of conservatives and liberals.

The volume is provided with a well prepared and highly valuable "Essay on Sources," although it is difficult to understand the statement, p. 385, that "the wealth of Catholic newspaper material covering the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the holdings of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia . . . was extensively used for the first time (italics ours)." Three appendices contain the texts respectively of the Knights' ritual, the "Secret Work," of the proposed address of Bishop John J. Keane before the Richmond convention (1886) of the Knights, and of Gibbons' Roman Memorial of 1887. The book is illustrated with portraits of Gibbons and Powderly and with two contemporary cartoons, and is provided with a map of trouble spots in Pennsylvania and with an index of nineteen pages. THOMAS F. O'CONNOR.

The Confederate States of America, 1861-1865, by E.

Merton Coulter. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1950. pp. x, 644. \$7.00

Three volumes of the series, *A History of the South*, have already appeared and have been reviewed in the BULLETIN. This, volume seven, carries this regional enterprise through the period of the War, a term which has only one connotation in Southern history. As in all other volumes, the level of scholarship and writing, together with the physical construction, is excellent, making the entire project a highly valuable one.

For the most part, any history of the Confederacy is treading upon familiar historical ground. Monographic material has been voluminous; hence the task of any writer such as Mr. Coulter becomes in part a task of organization. This has been well done, but ample original material has also been incorporated to give a fresh aspect to the completed product.

Certain points in Civil War history have long been highly controversial, and Mr. Coulter's views on these deserve to be mentioned, although they will not be agreed to by all students of the period. First of these is, "Why did the South secede?" In answer the author minimizes the role of slavery and its protection, stresses the incipient nationalism of the area and declares, "In fact, the Southern movement was a revolt of conservatism against the modernism of the North." To the question, "Did secession mean war?", Mr. Coulter answers that the South never felt the two were synonymous and cites the familiar slogan in the area that "A lady's thimble will hold all the blood that will be shed." On the problem of whether the South as a whole approved of secession, an emphatic affirmative is given by the author, who finds that the movement was not just one of the minority of prominent politicians.

On these points a sizable body of opinion will agree with the author, but on the next he will be in a decided minority. On page 566 the question is asked, "Why did the Confederacy fail?", and the answer is given. Mr. Coulter declares, "The forces leading to defeat were many, but they may be summed up in this one fact: The people did not will hard enough and long enough

to win. Wars in those times were not inevitably won by the side strongest in material resources and numbers of soldiers; otherwise the South would have been foolhardy to enter the struggle. It was not the last dollar or the last soldier, but the last ounce of will power or morale." This opinion the reviewer cannot accept. The "will power or morale" of the North could hardly be said to be better than that of the South; certainly the bulk of the Northern populace lacked the determination of the Southern people; equally certainly their unity of purpose was no greater; certainly their capacity for sacrifice was not distinguished. To be sure, wars were not *inevitably* won by the side with the greatest numbers of men or quantity of material. However, the Civil War was not a medieval struggle; it was approaching modern warfare and the odds against a side as hopelessly outclassed as the South was in its facilities for the production of the necessities of war, as easily depleted in its manpower, as deficient in financial resources, were certainly overwhelming.

However, these criticisms apply only to a small number of pages. The book is a highly useful summary of the period: it throws much light on somewhat neglected phases of Southern life and culture during the era of the War; it is well documented and equipped with an excellent critical bibliography, and it is thoroughly readable.

JASPER W. CROSS.

Wealth of the American People: A History of Their Economic Life, by James A. Barnes. New York. Prentice-Hall. 1949. pp. 910. \$5.75

This is one of an ever-increasing number of textbooks in American economic history that have been appearing since the War. The title is somewhat misleading in so far as it is not wealth so much as the social process by which wealth is utilized and developed that would seem to be the proper subject matter of the economic historian. Anticipating this objection, Professor Barnes in his introduction defends the use of this unusual title with the observation that "... the one great distinguishing thing of Americans is their wealth. ..."

Few authors have succeeded as well in capturing the color and the drama of American economic life. His narrative style has a smoothness, clarity, and interesting quality quite remarkable for a textbook. Well-selected original sources have been skillfully interwoven to make his account vivid as well as authentic. Unfortunately, however, the author has missed several opportunities to demonstrate the linkage between the course of American economic history with certain fundamental economic principles or concepts.

As a textbook this work presents certain noteworthy handicaps. It contains 865 pages of text in quite small print. The deletion of some unessential details, interesting though they are, would make the book more manageable to the student reader. A more serious defect is the dearth of illustrations, and especially maps.

Despite these limitations, Professor Barnes should be commended for a work of painstaking research that makes absorbing reading and remains free of special pleading.

DON A. LIVINGSTON.

This Was America, by Oscar Handlin. Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University Press. pp. 602. \$6.00

This is a fascinatingly interesting volume. Humans like to know what others think of them. When the opinions are complimentary, we are pleasantly flattered; when the observations are otherwise, we may not enjoy facing the verdict but we can, nevertheless, benefit. Over the years the United States and its people have been the subject of comment, favorable and adverse, by many European travelers. The author has gathered a cross-section of this comment—forty viewpoints—and served it up with the proper spice of piquant editorial information. Ten selections have been chosen for each of four stages of our national development, dating from the eighteenth century to André Maurois' comments in 1939. What makes this book particularly delightful is the fact that the observations of the "regularly quoted travelers" have been passed over to make room for the views of men and women whose writings about America have been in large measure unknown to most Americans. They make up a varied galaxy—merchants, scientists, authors, churchmen, just plain people. Another point worthy of commendation is that the selections are from the writings of Continental Europeans. The editor justifies this basis of choice with the very pertinent note that "men of Continental cultures, unlike most visitors from Great Britain, often perceived that surface similarities concealed fundamental differences." The editor's own short introduction to each of the four sections is a gem of historical analysis. The book is highly recommended to historians of the United States, especially to those most interested in social patterns and habits of the Americans. Nor does one need to be a professional to enjoy its content.

JOHN F. BANNON.

Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War, by Colonel G. F. R. Henderson, C.B. New York. Longmans, Green and Company. 1949. pp. xxiv, 737. \$6.00

Colonel Henderson's biography of Stonewall Jackson has long been the standard biography of one of the outstanding Confederate generals. It manages to overcome two handicaps to retain that position. First, it is now old, having been originally published in 1898 in London in a different format; second, its author is British and hence might be expected to have little knowledge of the America about which he is writing. Despite the age of the volume, it seems to have incorporated virtually all that was known about Jackson at that time and relatively little has appeared to change the picture since that time. On the second score, Henderson shows an amazing knowledge of and understanding of mid-nineteenth-century America.

An unusually strong point of the volume is the author's ability to realize both the Southern reasons for secession and the Northern unwillingness to permit it. Even many American writers have badly lacked his insight on this field.

Stonewall Jackson is also to be commended for its style.

JASPER W. CROSS.